



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

**IMPLICATIONS OF CHINA'S GROWING MILITARY
DIPLOMATIC CLOUT FOR THE UNITED STATES:
COOPERATION, COMPETITION OR CONFLICT?**

by

Steven X. Li

March 2009

Thesis Advisor:

Alice L. Miller

Second Reader:

Christopher P. Twomey

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE March 2009	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Implications of China's Growing Military Diplomatic Clout for the United States: Cooperation, Competition or Conflict?			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Steven X. Li				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) China's military capabilities are growing and so is Beijing's ability to employ its military in diplomatic capacities. Since the Chinese military's power projection capabilities still remain limited, the preponderance of its activities still fall within Asia. This thesis uses a three-step process (comparing, analyzing and extracting implications) to assess if increased levels of Chinese military diplomacy will shift the Sino-U.S. military relationship towards competition, cooperation, or conflict. This research effort finds that differences in U.S. and Chinese capabilities and political interests lead disparities in military diplomacy activity level, selection of strategic partners, and preferred diplomacy tools. However, despite these differences, the potential for increased Sino-U.S. military cooperation remains high. In order to capitalize on such potentials, policymakers should endorse a contingent-based cooperative approach to building military-to-military relations between the United States and China. This type of an approach encourages China to become more of a "responsible stakeholder" and exert positive influence in Asia through its military interactions.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS People's Republic of China, United States, Military Relations, Military Diplomacy			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 145	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**IMPLICATIONS OF CHINA'S GROWING MILITARY DIPLOMATIC CLOUT
FOR THE UNITED STATES: COOPERATION, COMPETITION OR
CONFLICT?**

Steven X. Li
Major, United States Air Force
B.S., United States Air Force Academy, 1998

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES
(FAR EAST, SOUTHEAST ASIA, PACIFIC)**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
March 2009**

Author: Steven X. Li

Approved by: Alice L. Miller
Thesis Advisor

Christopher P. Twomey
Second Reader

Harold A. Trinkunas, PhD
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

China's military capabilities are growing and so is Beijing's ability to employ its military in diplomatic capacities. Since the Chinese military's power projection capabilities still remain limited, the preponderance of its activities still fall within Asia. This thesis uses a three-step process (comparing, analyzing and extracting implications) to assess if increased levels of Chinese military diplomacy will shift the Sino-U.S. military relationship towards competition, cooperation, or conflict. This research effort finds that differences in U.S. and Chinese capabilities and political interests lead disparities in military diplomacy activity level, selection of strategic partners, and preferred diplomacy tools. However, despite these differences, the potential for increased Sino-U.S. military cooperation remains high. In order to capitalize on such potentials, policymakers should endorse a contingent-based cooperative approach to building military-to-military relations between the United States and China. This type of an approach encourages China to become more of a "responsible stakeholder" and exert positive influence in Asia through its military interactions.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	MAJOR RESEARCH QUESTION.....	1
B.	IMPORTANCE.....	1
C.	PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES	3
D.	LITERATURE REVIEW	4
E.	METHODS AND SOURCES.....	11
F.	THESIS OVERVIEW	13
II.	MILITARY DIPLOMACY IN ASIA.....	17
A.	ENGAGEMENT PATTERNS.....	17
B.	ENGAGEMENT TOOLS	20
1.	Strategic-level Activities	20
2.	Regional Activities	22
3.	Professional Military Education Exchanges.....	24
4.	Non-traditional Security Cooperation	26
5.	Summary.....	29
III.	GENERAL TRENDS ANALYSIS	33
A.	OVERALL ACTIVITY LEVEL DISPARITY	34
B.	STRATEGIC PARTNERS	36
1.	U.S.-Japan Security Relations	36
2.	U.S.-Korea Security Relations	38
3.	U.S.-Philippine Security Relations.....	42
4.	U.S.-Singapore Security Relations.....	45
5.	U.S.-Thai Security Relations.....	47
6.	China’s Strategic Partners	50
7.	China-Pakistan Security Relations.....	51
8.	China-Russia Security Relations	52
9.	China-Burma Security Relations.....	54
10.	China-North Korea Security Relations.....	56
11.	Summary.....	59
C.	PREFERRED TOOLS	59
1.	Consultations and Strategic Dialogues.....	60
2.	State-to-State Military Protocols	61
3.	Regional Forums	61
4.	Peacekeeping	65
5.	Summary.....	66
D.	THE CAVEAT TO MEASURING SUCCESS	67
E.	SUMMARY	68
IV.	IMPLICATIONS	71
A.	COMPETITION	71
B.	COOPERATION	74

C.	CONFLICT	78
1.	The Optimistic Future Prospect	80
2.	Summary.....	84
V.	CONCLUSION	85
A.	POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	88
B.	AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY	90
APPENDIX A.	ARMS TRANSFERS	93
A.	U.S. ARMS TRANSFERS.....	93
B.	PRC ARMS TRANSFERS.....	104
APPENDIX B.	TSCMIS DATA	107
APPENDIX C.	PLA DIPLOMACY ACTIVITIES	111
LIST OF REFERENCES.....		121
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST		129

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Countries of Engagement.....	18
Table 2.	China's Joint Military Exercises with Asian Countries Since 2001	23
Table 3.	Comparative Advantage across All Activities.....	30

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AOR	Area of Responsibility
ARF	ASEAN Regional Forum
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BVR	Beyond Visual Range
CICA	Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia
CMC	Central Military Commission
CPC	Communist Party of China
CSCAP	Council on Security Cooperation in the Asia- Pacific Region
DoS	Department of State
EAS	East Asian Summit
EU	European Union
IMET	International Education and Training
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
JSDF	Japanese Self Defense Forces
NEACD	Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue
NDS	National Defense Strategy
NMS	National Military Strategy
NSS	National Security Strategy
PLA	People’s Liberation Army
PME	Professional Military Education
PRC	People’s Republic of China
SCO	Shanghai Cooperation Organization
TSCMIS	Theater Security Cooperation Management Information System
UN	United Nations
USPACOM	United States Pacific Command
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my wife Lingo, thank you for taking great care of our family during this process. To my son Keoni, sorry daddy could not play with you more. To Dr. Miller and Dr. Twomey, thank you for nurturing me through this thesis.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

A. MAJOR RESEARCH QUESTION

The military capabilities of the People's Republic of China (PRC) are improving. One facet of improvement is the People's Liberation Army's (PLA) ability to function as an instrument of diplomacy. The PLA's diplomatic efforts are increasingly evident in Asia. These efforts have potential implications for American interests and so deserve attention.

The U.S. military currently conducts diplomatic engagements in Asia with many of the same countries with which the PLA interacts. In addition, the expanding scope of PLA diplomatic activities overlaps with current U.S. efforts in activity type. This thesis attempts to compare the U.S. military and the PLA's diplomatic activities in Asia in order to assess the impact of these activities on future military-to-military relations between the United States and China.

B. IMPORTANCE

The 2008 U.S. National Defense Strategy (NDS) declares that China is "one ascendant state with the potential for competing with the United States." The NDS goes on to state that the United States should "hedge against China's growing military modernization and the impact of its strategic choices upon international security."¹ China's strategic choices have always received significant attention. In recent years, some Western observers have increased their attention on China's growing use of diplomacy as a tool of engagement to advance its strategic choices.

Scholars such as Philip Saunders attribute China's new global activism to goals for securing inputs for the economy, protecting against a potential U.S. containment strategy, expanding Chinese political influence, and pursuing Chinese commercial

¹ Department of Defense, *National Defense Strategy* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2008), 2.

interests.² According to Saunders, China is using diplomacy to expand its influence in Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East.³ Other scholars—such as Bates Gill, author of *Rising Star*, and Joshua Kurlatzick, author of *Charm Offensive*--make similar observations.⁴

The PLA is an instrument of PRC diplomacy. As Kristen Gunness indicates in her paper “China’s Military Diplomacy in an Era of Change,” the Chinese leadership considers the PLA’s conduct of foreign military relations to be an activity that supports Beijing’s strategic agenda.⁵ In this view, PRC leadership sees the PLA’s overseas military activities as support for political and strategic objectives, not freestanding military initiatives conducted explicitly for defense purposes.⁶

Washington should consider the possible implications of PLA diplomacy for American interests in order to adjust its own military diplomacy. Examining the types of PLA diplomatic activity, the countries it engages, and the nature of its established relationships may yield recommendations on how to counter Chinese activities that hinder American interests on one hand, and on the other hand, enhance stability and the chances for cooperation between U.S. and Chinese militaries where they do not. Since both countries are likely to continue using the military as a tool of diplomacy, the logical approach is to examine the context of the two countries’ military diplomacy activities to derive insight on how to execute future endeavors best.

Asia is an important developing region. The developing countries in this region play an increasingly important role in issues such as energy security or alliance building. Therefore, creating favorable environments in this region has tremendous value.

² Phillip C. Saunders, “China’s Global Activism: Strategy, Drivers, and Tools,” October 2006, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Occasional_Papers/OCP4.pdf (accessed August 2, 2008), 6.

³ Ibid., 2.

⁴ Bates Gill, *Rising Star: China’s New Security Diplomacy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2007); Joshua Kurlantzick, *Charm Offensive: How China’s Softpower Is Transforming the World* (Binghamton: Vail-Ballou Press, 2007).

⁵ Kristen Gunness, “China’s Military Diplomacy in an Era of Change,” June 20, 2006, www.ndu.edu/inss/symposia/pacific2006/gunnesspaper.pdf (accessed March 1, 2008), 2.

⁶ David Finkelstein, *Engaging DoD: Chinese Perspectives on Military Relations with the United States* (Alexandria: The CNA Corporation, 1999), vii.

The PRC is using diplomacy to create such favorable environments through increasing activism. Military diplomacy is a component of China's overall diplomacy and is, consequently, worth examining. This thesis seeks a better understanding of how PLA diplomacy affects U.S. military diplomacy in Asia.

C. PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES

Some important questions have been researched to complete this thesis project. These questions frame the approach to answering how the PLA's military diplomacy in Asia affects U.S. military efforts in the same region. The questions fall into three categories: policy objectives, military diplomacy, and military relations.

- Policy objectives:
 - What are the foreign policy objectives of the United States and China?
 - What are the broader roles that each country's military plays in the pursuit of these goals?
- Military diplomacy:
 - What are the roles of U.S. and Chinese military diplomacy in achieving foreign policy objectives?
 - How do the U.S. and Chinese militaries carry out their respective diplomacy efforts?
 - At what levels are diplomatic engagements taking place?
- Military relations:
 - What is the current atmosphere of Sino-U.S. military relations?
 - What major factors influence the current relationship?

This thesis concludes that while the military diplomacy objectives of the Chinese and U.S. militaries overlap and can lead to a degree of competition, the patterns of engagement and overarching security interests of both countries present opportunities for increased cooperation.

D. LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to assess how U.S. and Chinese military diplomacy activities abroad influence the relationship between the two countries, one must first understand what the foreign policy objectives of each country are. The *U.S. National Security Strategy (NSS)* issued in the name of the president, and the *Strategic Plan* published by the Department of State (DoS), provide direction for U.S. foreign policy. The current objectives are listed as:

- Champion aspirations for human dignity;
- Strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and work to prevent attacks against us and our friends;
- Work with others to defuse regional conflicts;
- Prevent our enemies from threatening us, our allies, and our friends with weapons of mass destruction (WMD);
- Ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade;
- Expand the circle of development by opening societies and building the infrastructure of democracy;
- Develop agendas for cooperative action with other main centers of global power;
- Transform America's national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century; and
- Engage the opportunities and confront the challenges of globalization.⁷

Based on these objectives, DoS acts as the lead agency for implementation. DoS publishes a *Strategic Plan* on how to support the policy positions set forth by the president in the *NSS*. The *Strategic Plan* "presents how the Department of State and USAID will implement U.S. foreign policy and development assistance."⁸ According to the *Strategic Plan*, the current DoS objectives are:

⁷ President George W. Bush, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2006), 1.

⁸ United States Department of State, *Security, Democracy, Prosperity; Strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2004-2009* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Press, 2003), preface.

- Achieve peace and security;
- Advance sustainable development and global interests;
- Promote international understanding; and
- Strengthen diplomatic and program capabilities.⁹

Once the *NSS* and *Strategic Plan* provide foreign policy guidance through stated objectives, the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) direct how military diplomacy supports U.S foreign policy objectives. This direction is regulated by objectives published in the *National Defense Strategy (NDS)* and *National Military Strategy (NMS)*. Currently, the *NDS* outlines five objectives to “support the *NSS* and provide enduring security for the American people.”¹⁰ These objectives are:

- Defend the homeland;
- Win the Long War (against terrorism);
- Promote security;
- Deter conflict; and
- Win our nation’s wars.¹¹

In addition to the *NDS* objectives, the *NMS* also establishes three supporting military objectives:

- Protect the United States against external attacks and aggression;
- Prevent conflict and surprise attack; and
- Prevail against adversaries.¹²

⁹ United States Department of State, *Security, Democracy, Prosperity; Strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2004-2009*, 6-38.

¹⁰ Department of Defense, *National Defense Strategy* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2008), 6.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Joint Chiefs of Staff, *The National Military Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Press, 2004), 9.

Ultimately, the role of military diplomacy that emerges from the objectives outlined by the *NSS*, *Strategic Plan*, *NDS*, and *NMS*, is to support U.S. foreign policy by shaping a global environment that promotes security and deters conflict through building alliances, diffusing regional conflicts, promoting international understanding, and strengthening diplomatic and program capabilities.

Beijing uses a similar process to prescribe the objectives of PLA diplomacy. The Communist Party of China (CPC) guides the direction of Chinese foreign policy. According to Beijing, the basic objectives of Chinese foreign policy “center on safeguarding national independence and state sovereignty, and creating an international environment favorable to its reform, opening and modernization efforts, as well as maintaining world peace and promoting common development.”¹³ The CPC constitution further states that the CPC “adheres to an independent foreign policy of peace, follows the path of peaceful development and a win-win strategy of opening up, and pushes for the building of a harmonious world of lasting peace and common prosperity.”¹⁴ Specific objectives of Chinese foreign policy outlined by the 17th National Congress of the CPC include:

- Conforming to the trend of history and safeguarding mankind's common interests;
- Establishing a new international political and economic order based on fairness and reason;
- Safeguarding world diversity, advocating democracy with respect to international relations and diversified patterns of development;
- Opposing all forms of terrorism;
- Improving and developing relations with developed countries, prioritizing the interests of all peoples irrespective of social or ideological differences, expanding common interests, and solving disputes on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence;

¹³ Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the United States of America, *Main Characteristics of China's Foreign Policy*, <http://www.china-embassy.org/eng/zmgx/zgwjzc/t35077.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008).

¹⁴ Communist Party of China, *Constitution of the Communist Party of China*, November 14, 2002, <http://www.learnworld.com/COURSES/P141/CCP-Constitution-Nov-2002.html> (accessed September 12, 2008).

- Strengthening good-neighborly relations with surrounding countries and fostering regional cooperation as friends and partners;
- Strengthening unity and cooperation with developing countries, building up mutual understanding, trust and support, widening the areas of cooperation; and
- Actively participating in multilateral diplomatic activities, playing a vigorous role in the UN and other international and regional organizations, and supporting efforts to safeguard the legitimate rights of developing countries.¹⁵

The PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs implements the foreign policy guidance set forth by the CPC. “China's independent foreign policy of peace” is the Foreign Ministry’s plan for carrying out CPC guidance. The objectives of the Policy of Peace are to:

- Preserve China's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity;
- Create a favorable international environment for China's reform, opening up and modernizing construction; and
- Maintain world peace and propel common development.

After the CPC and Foreign Ministry establishes foreign policy guidelines, the Central Military Commission (CMC) guides the military diplomacy role of the PLA. The 2006 PRC Defense White Paper advertises the role of military diplomacy as “fostering a security environment conducive to China's peaceful development.” According to the “National Defense Policy” section of the Defense White Paper, the PLA:

- Maintains military contacts with other countries on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence;
- Develops cooperative military relations that are non-aligned, non-confrontational and not directed against any third party;
- Takes part in international security cooperation, strengthens strategic coordination and consultation with major powers and neighboring countries;
- Conducts bilateral or multilateral joint military exercises;
- Promotes the establishment of just and effective collective security mechanisms and military confidence-building mechanisms;

¹⁵ 17th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, *17th National Congress of the Communist Party of China Press Center*, October 7, 2007, <http://english.cpcnews.cn/92249/92259/6277921.html> (accessed August 17, 2008).

- Works with other countries to prevent conflicts and wars;
- Stands for effective disarmament and arms control that are just, reasonable, comprehensive and balanced in nature;
- Opposes nuclear proliferation, and endeavors to advance the process of international nuclear disarmament;
- Observes the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, honors its international obligations, and participates in UN peacekeeping operations, international counter-terrorism cooperation and international disaster relief operations; and
- Plays an active part in maintaining global and regional peace and stability.¹⁶

The CPC, Foreign Ministry, and CMC policies frame objectives for PLA diplomacy. In examining these policies, military diplomacy objectives can be generally summed up as strengthening China's ability to preserve sovereignty and territorial integrity, creating a favorable international environment for China's economic growth, and expanding Chinese participation in shaping the world's security environment.

After extracting and assessing U.S. and Chinese military diplomacy objectives from the governing policies of the respective countries, this thesis focuses on how respective objectives are translated into action and how these actions affect Sino-U.S. relations. Research conducted in this area yielded limited literature dedicated to the subject. Existing works do not directly address the subject of this thesis and generally fall into one of three categories—military modernization, diplomacy effectiveness, and Sino-U.S. military relations. The military modernization category concentrates on evolving PLA military capabilities in terms of hardware, doctrine, and budget. The diplomatic competence category elaborates on the waxing of Chinese and waning of U.S. diplomacy clout from the foreign policy or political perspective. The military relations category outlines how the United States and China engage each other and other countries, but

¹⁶ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's Defense White Paper 2006*, December 29, 2006, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/wp2006.html#2> (accessed August 17, 2008).

stops short of conducting comparisons between U.S. and Chinese military relations abroad or drawing conclusions about how such engagements with other countries directly affect Sino-U.S. military relations.

The evolution of China's military capability has received tremendous attention in recent years. Observers extensively scrutinize areas such as the growth of China's military budget, modernizations in the PLA's hardware, and evolution in Chinese military doctrine.¹⁷ They further speculate on the implications of these recent military developments on Sino-U.S. Relations¹⁸ and on China's role in the world order.¹⁹

Also receiving attention in recent years is how Beijing is becoming increasingly savvy in using "soft power" to advance its goals.²⁰ Books such as Bates Gill's *Rising Star* and Joshua Kurlantzick's *Charm Offensive* all conclude that China increasingly favors diplomacy as the tool of choice to advance Beijing's foreign policy.²¹ As Kurlantzick states:

¹⁷ For an overview of the latest military developments in PLA capabilities and strategies, see Office of the Secretary of Defense, "Military Power of the People's Republic of China," Annual Report to Congress (2008); Dennis J. Blasko, "Observations on Military Modernization and International Influence—An Alternate View," *A Paper Prepared for the National Defense University Conference on China's Global Activism: Implications for U.S. Security Interests* (National Defense University, June 20, 2006); for the latest figures in PLA budget changes, see Zhu Zhe, "China Daily: Defense Budget to Rise by 17.6 Percent," *Open Source Center*, March 5, 2008, <https://www.opensource.gov/portal/server.pt/gateway/PTARGS> (accessed March 13, 2008).

¹⁸ Jonathan D. Pollack, "Chinese Military Power: What Vexes the United States and Why?," *Orbis*, (Fall 2007): 635-650.

¹⁹ For discussions on China's role in the international order, see Stephanie Kleine-Ahlbrandt and Andrew Small, "China's New Dictatorship Democracy: Is Beijing Parting with Pariahs?," *Foreign Affairs* (January/February 2008): 38; James J. Przystup and Phillip C. Saunders, "Visions of Order: Japan and China in U.S. Strategy," *Strategic Forum* (National Defense University), June 2006.

²⁰ Joseph Nye first coined the term and said, "Soft power rests on the ability to shape the preferences of others...It is leading by example and attracting others to do what you want." He excluded using elements like investment, trade and formal diplomacy as a part of soft power because he considered them more concrete carrots and sticks. However, scholars have started to use the term in broader contexts that include economic, diplomatic and aid activities. The term is used in this broader context here.

²¹ Bates Gill, *Rising Star: China's New Security Diplomacy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2007); Joshua Kurlantzick, *Charm Offensive: How China's Softpower Is Transforming the World* (Binghamton: Vail-Ballou Press, 2007); Avery Goldstein, "The Diplomatic Face of China's Grand Strategy: A Rising Power's Emerging Choice," *The China Quarterly* (December 2001): 835-864; Congressional Research Service, "China's Foreign Policy and 'Soft Power' in South America, Asia, and Africa, Report for Congress (Washington, 2008).

The ultimate test of a country's influence is its ability to create a string of friends around the world; great powers build relationships spanning continents. China has begun creating an alternative pole to Western democracies in international organizations and global diplomacy.²²

Beijing has definitively become increasingly proficient in wielding diplomacy, and for good reason.²³ Some observers point to significant increases in international exchanges and involvement by Beijing that are starting to challenge U.S. hegemony.²⁴

In addition, some experts have noted China's concurrent rise in military and diplomatic clout and focus on how China is employing the military as a diplomacy tool to advance its foreign policy.²⁵ Kristen Gunness at CNA points out that PLA diplomacy plays an integral part in Beijing's foreign policy implementation.²⁶ PLA experts such as Kenneth Allen have documented the type and frequency of diplomatic activities the PLA has participated in abroad.²⁷ These analyses spotlight the fact that Chinese military diplomacy activities are on the increase and warrant a respective increase in attention.

Despite these efforts, the literature dedicated specifically to Chinese military diplomacy still remains limited in scope and depth. Existing works do not clearly address how U.S. and PLA military diplomacy affects the two militaries' relationship with each

²² Joshua Kurlantzick, *Charm Offensive: How China's Soft Power is Transforming the World* (Yale University Press, 2007), 146.

²³ For excellent discussions on the increased use of diplomacy, see Yiwei Wang, "Public Diplomacy and the Rise of Chinese Soft Power," *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science* (March 2008); Evan Medeiros and Taylor Fravel, "China's New Diplomacy," *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2003): 22-35; Evelyn Goh, "Southeast Asian Perspectives on the China Challenge," *The Journal of Strategic Studies* (August–October 2007): 809-830; Hugo Restall, "China's Bid for Asian Hegemony," *Far Eastern Economic Review* (May 2007): 10-14.

²⁴ See Andrew Erickson and Lyle Goldstein, "Hoping for the Best, Preparing for the Worst: China's Response to U.S. Hegemony," *Journal of Strategic Studies* (December 2006): 962-968.

²⁵ For discussions on how the PLA acts as a diplomacy tool, see Kristen Gunness, "China's Military Diplomacy in an Era of Change," June 20, 2006, www.ndu.edu/inss/symposia/pacific2006/gunnesspaper.pdf (accessed March 1, 2008); multiple Kenneth Allen papers including Kenneth Allen, *PLA Diplomacy in Asia: Content and Consequences* (Alexandria: The CNA Corporation); Kenneth Allen, *China's Foreign Military Relations: 2003-2004* (Alexandria: The CNA Corporation).

²⁶ Kristen Gunness, "China's Military Diplomacy in an Era of Change," June 20, 2006, www.ndu.edu/inss/symposia/pacific2006/gunnesspaper.pdf (accessed March 1, 2008), 2.

²⁷ Kenneth W. Allen is a Senior Analyst of the China Studies Center at The CNA Corporation. He has written extensively on the PLA including titles such as "PLA Diplomacy in Asia," "China's Foreign Military Relations," and "PLA Air Force Foreign Relations."

other. Scholars have examined Sino-U.S. military relations only in the instance of direct engagements between the PLA and the U.S. military.²⁸ The general conclusion is that bilateral military relations have still fully not recovered since cutting off contact after the Tiananmen crackdown in 1989.²⁹

The limited literature on Chinese military diplomacy is particularly noticeable with respect to the PLA's diplomacy efforts in Asia and its impacts on U.S. military diplomacy in the same region. These inadequacies indicate that this thesis fills an important gap.

E. METHODS AND SOURCES

This thesis conducts a comparative analysis of Chinese and U.S. military diplomacy efforts since 2001 by examining each country's military diplomatic activities in Asia. The comparison assesses differences in overall activity levels, countries of focus, activity types, and levels of engagement. The independent variable is PLA diplomatic activities, and the dependent variable is U.S. military diplomacy activities.

The period of examination starts in 2001 because the year marked an obvious shift in Beijing's approach to foreign policy. Since 2001, China has significantly expanded its global activism.³⁰ As Phillip Saunders States, "Beijing has taken advantage of opportunities created by the U.S. focus on terrorism, the unpopularity of some American policies (especially in the Muslim world), and by relative U.S. neglect of Latin America, Africa, and Southeast Asia."³¹ In this context, China's approach appears

²⁸ For an overview on Sino-U.S. military to military relations, see Shirley A. Kan, *U.S.-China Military Contacts: Issues for Congress*, Report for Congress (Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2008).

²⁹ Shirley Kan, *U.S.-China Military Contacts: Issues for Congress* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2007).

³⁰ For details on the evolution of China's strategic objectives, see Phillip C. Saunders, "China's Global Activism: Strategy, Drivers, and Tools," October 2006, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Occasional_Papers/OCP4.pdf (accessed August 2, 2008).

³¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

relatively attractive to developing countries who are “willing to cooperate in quiet efforts to defend the principle of sovereignty, resist U.S. attempts to assert a right to democratic governance, and oppose U.S. intervention.”³²

The types of military diplomacy engagements are grouped into four categories, each with associated activities:

- Strategic-level activities
 - Defense consultations and strategic dialogues
 - Arms transfers
 - Military exchanges
- Regional activities
 - State-to-State military protocols
 - Participation in military exercises
 - Participation in regional forums
- Professional military education exchanges
 - Sending officers abroad
 - Receiving foreign officers
- Cooperation with other nations in non-traditional security areas
 - Counter-terrorism cooperation
 - Peacekeeping operations
 - Disaster relief / crises response operations

These categories serve as the framework for organizing the activities that constitute military diplomacy.³³

Asia is selected as the region of study because Washington and Beijing both actively engage the countries in this region on different levels and through different types of military-related activities. While focusing on specific Asian countries as case studies

³² For details on the evolution of China’s strategic objectives, see Phillip C. Saunders, “China’s Global Activism: Strategy, Drivers, and Tools,” October 2006, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Occasional_Papers/OCP4.pdf (accessed August 2, 2008), 6.

³³ These categories are outlined by Kristen Gunness. See Kristen Gunness, “China’s Military Diplomacy in an Era of Change,” June 20, 2006, www.ndu.edu/inss/symposia/pacific2006/gunnesspaper.pdf (accessed March 1, 2008).

may enhance the focus on the depth of study, doing so would preclude an accurate comparison of the diplomatic activities conducted by U.S. and Chinese militaries across the region.

This thesis uses a combination of primary and secondary sources from both U.S. and Chinese publications along with U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM) Theater Security Cooperation records to extract accurate representations of the military diplomacy activities of each country. Publications come from a blend of government, media, and scholarly documents.

F. THESIS OVERVIEW

This thesis is divided into five chapters. This chapter is the introduction. Chapter II summarizes and compares raw data reflecting the activities of both militaries. Chapter III analyzes the trends that emerge from the comparison of activities. Chapter IV assesses the implications the activities have on increasing the potential for competition, cooperation or conflict between the U.S. and Chinese militaries. Finally, the Conclusion chapter offers a summary of findings and policy recommendations, and suggests areas for further study.

Chapter II consolidates and compares data reflecting the military diplomacy activities of the U.S. and Chinese militaries. This comparison reveals disparities in three particular areas—the overall activity level, engagement partners, and diplomatic tools of choice. In surveying the overall military diplomacy level, this research project found that the volume of U.S. military activities far exceeds that of its Chinese counterparts. In the realm of engagement partners, political interests provided dense security ties between the U.S. military and Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. The PLA maintained similar close-knit defense-centric relationships with Pakistan, Russia, Burma and North Korea. In the effort to sustain security relationships, the U.S. military took a well-balanced approach to exercising all the tools available under the umbrella of military diplomacy. The PLA efforts were less diverse and particularly challenged the U.S. military in conducting defense consultations and strategic dialogues, state-to-state military protocols, participation in regional forums, and peacekeeping operations.

Chapter III addresses the differences described above in detail by examining the reasons for such differences. The chapter offers three suggestions. First, the overall military diplomacy activity level disparity between the U.S. and Chinese militaries is attributed to disproportions in military capabilities between the two forces. The U.S. military affords the United States power projection capabilities commensurate with that of a superpower. The PLA simply cannot match such capabilities and consequently resorts to more limited objectives. Second, barring significant shifts in political climates or readjustment of military diplomacy efforts, the national interests binding the security relationships between the U.S. and Chinese militaries and their respective security partners will mostly likely continue to hold current relationships in place. With the exception of Thailand and Pakistan, most U.S. or Chinese strategic partners appear to be deeply rooted in their security relationships with either the U.S. military or the PLA. Third, there is no immediate threat to U.S. military diplomacy efforts in Asia because the United States' widespread capacity to conduct military diplomacy in the region still surpasses that of the PLA. While the PLA's efforts are notable in some diplomatic activities, the U.S. military is still dominating most diplomatic relationships.

Chapter IV assesses the implications that differences in defense diplomacy have on the future of military-to-military relations between the United States and China. The assessment finds that while the context created by current activities and relationships can offer persuasive supporting evidence for competition, cooperation and conflict, the evidence for improved cooperation appears most predominant. The reasoning is that although competition can offer marginal benefits by improving relationships with specific nations, associated negative consequences vis-à-vis increased threat perceptions negate net gains in enhancing net influence. Furthermore, even though conflict over central security differences can arise, either the United States or China stands to benefit from conflict. On the other hand, regional cooperation through conducting collective military diplomacy affords both countries the opportunity to enhance stability in the region and consolidate influence throughout Asia. The costs and benefits associated with competition, cooperation or conflict should, therefore, logically lead to increased cooperation between the U.S. and Chinese militaries.

The concluding chapter offers policy recommendations and suggests directions for further study. This thesis recommends a policy approach consistent with former Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick's concept of encouraging China to become more of a "responsible stakeholder." In the spirit of this concept, the United States should promote a contingent-based cooperative military-to-military relationship with the PLA. The basis of the relationship would be to cooperate with the PLA in order to afford China increasing opportunities to exert influence through military diplomacy. Cooperation will, of course, be contingent upon China's ability to increasingly demonstrate responsible behavior in conducting defense interactions, an area in which the PLA is already making progress.

In recommending further areas for study, this thesis proposes two specific tracks. The first track would be to better measure the effectiveness of military diplomacy by associating weighted values with specific military diplomacy tools. The purpose would be to measure the effective impact of military diplomacy more accurately by taking into consideration the perceived needs and desires of partner countries. The second track would be to reconsider the future of PLA diplomacy activities and implications for cooperation with the U.S. military against the backdrop of the current global economic slowdown. The PLA's shrinking resources and increasing potential role to maintain domestic stability at home, caused by the economic downturn, may alter previous estimations regarding military diplomacy activities. These alterations may have important implications and, hence, are worth researching.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. MILITARY DIPLOMACY IN ASIA

Asia is a region where both the U.S. military and the PLA actively engage in a robust number and variety of military diplomatic activities. China's limited power projection capabilities may limit the role of the PLA to a minor tool of influence outside Asia, but PLA military capabilities matter greatly inside the region.³⁴ According to the U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) Theater Security Cooperation Management Information System (TSCMIS), the U.S. military consistently conducted over 1,000 military-to-military contacts each year from 2001 to 2007 with countries in its area of responsibility (AOR). The type of activities employed in these contacts range from education exchange to non-traditional security cooperation. The PRC's military diplomacy activities, while also wide-ranging, fell short in volume when compared to U.S. activities. This chapter examines which Asian countries the U.S. military and the PLA interacted with and through what venues the interactions took place. The comparative assessment reveals both common ground and dissimilarities. In general, both militaries interacted with almost all Asian countries but each had idiosyncrasies regarding methods and frequency of engagements. While the U.S. military had particularly high levels of exchanges with select security partners and engaged Asian countries through a fairly well-balanced employment of methods, the PLA showed more consistency in activity level from country to country and predominantly interacted through high-level exchanges and regional forums.

A. ENGAGEMENT PATTERNS

Both the U.S. and Chinese militaries regularly engaged the majority of the countries in Asia. A list of Asian countries each military interacted with is in Table 1 below. Although both countries sustained military relations with most Asian countries,

³⁴ Phillip C. Saunders, "China's Global Activism: Strategy, Drivers, and Tools," October 2006, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Occasional_Papers/OC4.pdf (accessed August 2, 2008), 10.

there were some differences in engagement patterns. These differences stemmed from the level of interactions between respective militaries with the militaries of individual Asian countries.

Table 1. Countries of Engagement

COUNTRY	U.S. ENGAGEMENT	CHINA ENGAGEMENT
Bangladesh	Yes	Yes
Brunei Darussalam	Yes	Yes
Bhutan	Yes	No
Cambodia	Yes	Yes
D.P.R.K (North Korea)	Yes*	Yes
India	Yes	Yes
Indonesia	Yes	Yes
Japan	Yes	Yes
Kazakhstan	Yes	Yes
Kyrgyzstan	Yes	Yes
Laos	Yes	Yes
Malaysia	Yes	Yes
Mongolia	Yes	Yes*
Myanmar (Burma)	Yes*	Yes
Nepal	Yes	Yes
Pakistan	Yes	Yes
Philippines	Yes	Yes
ROK	Yes	Yes
Russia	Yes	Yes
Singapore	Yes	Yes
Sri Lanka	Yes	Yes
Taiwan	Yes	No
Tajikistan	Yes	Yes
Turkmenistan	Yes	No
Thailand	Yes	Yes
Timor-Leste	Yes	Yes
Uzbekistan	Yes	Yes
Viet Nam	Yes	Yes

* - Indicates sparse engagement from year to year and zero engagement in some years.

In assessing the level of interactions, the first evident observation is that the U.S. military conducted a higher volume of military diplomacy activities than the PLA. In comparisons year after year, the U.S. military activity level far exceeded that of the PLA. Consequently, in addition to comparing the volume of military diplomatic activities each country conducted, an assessment of how each country exercised each engagement tool is also necessary for deriving patterns in methods of engagement.

Looking beyond the numbers of engagements, the U.S. military and PLA both had noticeable voids in military relations activities with certain countries. China did not have any military interactions with Taiwan, Bhutan or Turkmenistan. China does not have military relations with Taiwan for political reasons, as it does not recognize Taiwan as a sovereign nation. This point of contention aside, Bhutan and Turkmenistan were the only variances where the United States maintained military relations with a select country and China did not. Apart from these three countries, both the United States and China also had instances of only maintaining sporadic engagements with certain countries. For the United States, these countries include North Korea and Burma. The United States had three military-to-military contacts with North Korea in 2005 but none in 2006 or 2007. With Burma, the United States had five military-to-military contacts between 2005 and 2006 but contact discontinued in 2007. China on the other hand, maintains active military relationships with both North Korea and Burma. In China's case, military engagements with Mongolia barely managed to register with only one contact in 2005. In contrast, the United States maintained a highly active level of military activities with Mongolia.

Just as there are noticeable voids in activity level with select countries, both the United States and China had a high volume of military engagement with certain countries. For the United States, Japan and South Korea consistently ranked in the top two positions for participating in the most number of activities with the U.S. military. Singapore, Thailand, and the Philippines normally occupied the third, fourth and fifth places.³⁵ For China, the margins for the top positions were smaller. The countries with the highest volume of engagement were Pakistan and Russia.

³⁵ See Appendix B for breakdown of TSCMIS yearly assessments.

B. ENGAGEMENT TOOLS

Even though the U.S. and Chinese militaries exercised common tools of engagement during the practice of military diplomacy in Asia, there was a discernable gap between how often each country employed particular engagement tools. The United States took a fairly well balanced approach and interacted with Asian countries using tools from each of the four categories of engagement: strategic-level activities, regional activities, PME exchanges, and non-traditional security cooperation. The U.S. military especially emphasized high-level visits, PME exchanges, bi-lateral/multi-lateral conferences, and joint exercises and training events. China demonstrated a more limited approach to military diplomacy by predominantly enhancing security relationships through regional activities such as regional forums and through high-level official visits or exchanges.

1. Strategic-level Activities

The first category of activities is strategic engagements. Activities that fall under this category include defense consultations and strategic dialogues, arms transfers, and military exchanges. The United States and China both consistently promoted military relations with Asian countries through these activities.

In the realm of defense consultations and strategic dialogues, the U.S. military engaged almost all Asian countries through holding bilateral/multi-lateral conferences. The number of instances varied from country to country. From 2005 to 2007, Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines ranked highest in the number of occurrences with averages of more than forty conferences per year. Burma, Bhutan and Timor-Leste had the lowest averages with the number of occurrences hovering in the low single digits per annum. North Korea was the only country with which the U.S. military did not actively participate in defense consultations or strategic dialogues.

China also took a very comprehensive approach in this area. From 2003 to 2006, China held defense consultations with Indonesia, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Russia and Vietnam. However, the average number of consultations and dialogues China held with respective countries were very low—usually ranging from one to two each year.³⁶

In conducting arms transfers, the United States demonstrated a larger and broader scale of activities. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the United States conducted arms transfers to the countries of Brunei, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, and Thailand in the period from 2001 to 2007. Of these countries, Japan, South Korean, Taiwan, Pakistan and Singapore, in particular, received the largest quantities of arms from the United States.³⁷

China's arms transfer activities were far less copious. During the same period, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Burma, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Thailand received arms transfers from China. The majority of China's arms transfers were to Bangladesh and Burma.³⁸

Under the final strategic level activity of military exchanges, the U.S. military maintained constant relationships with a higher number of Asian countries.³⁹ Bhutan, Burma, Laos, and North Korea were the only four countries that the U.S. military did not actively participate in consistent exchanges with.⁴⁰

China appeared to be less comprehensive in its participation in military-to-military exchanges. The PRC Defense White Papers listed all military-to-military

³⁶ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2006*, December 29, 2006, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/wp2006.html#2> (accessed August 17, 2008); People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2004*, December 2004, <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20041227/index.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008).

³⁷ See Appendix A.A for U.S. arms transfer details.

³⁸ See Appendix A.B. for Chinese arms transfer details.

³⁹ For the purposes of this research effort, military exchanges equate to military-to-military contacts that exclude high-level visits. High-level visits will be accounted for under state-to-state military protocols in a later segment.

⁴⁰ See Appendix B for breakdown of TSCMIS yearly assessments.

contacts including high-level visits as military exchanges. After eliminating such visits, military exchanges were limited to ten countries—Brunei, India, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan, Philippines, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, and Thailand.⁴¹

2. Regional Activities

Military engagements that classify as regional activities include state-to-state military protocols, participation in joint military exercises or training events, and participation in regional forums. The similarity in engagement patterns among these three types of activities varied drastically. While both the U.S. and Chinese militaries conducted extensive state-to-state military protocols with most of the countries in Asia, the U.S. military conducted a larger number of joint military exercises with a greater number of partners. In contrast, the PLA demonstrated more regional involvement via regional forums.

In state-to-state military protocols, both Washington and Beijing conducted military exchanges with the majority of Asian countries. The U.S. military held consistent recurring high-level visits with every country except for Bhutan, Burma, Laos, North Korea, Russia, and Timor-Leste. China was more active in conducting state-to-state military protocols from the perspective of the number of countries engaged. Bhutan and Taiwan, with whom the PRC has no military relations, were the only two countries that China did not engage through formal military protocols.⁴²

The large number of joint exercises and training activities the U.S. military accomplished in Asia overshadowed similar PLA activities. The disparity was not only evident in the number of countries respective militaries cooperated with, but also in the number of total occurrences from year to year. The U.S. military participated in joint military exercises and training events with all Asian countries except five—Bhutan,

⁴¹ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2006*, December 29, 2006, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/wp2006.html#2> (accessed August 17, 2008); People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2004*, December 2004, <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20041227/index.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008).

⁴² Assessment based on number of “high-level” visits tracked by PACOM in TSCMIS, and China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs in its annual publication of *China's Foreign Affairs*.

Burma, Laos, North Korea, and Timor-Leste. There were hundreds of joint exercises or training events each year between U.S. and host Asian countries. The highest numbers of incidents usually involved South Korea and Japan with the number of events ranging from 40 to 50 and 30 to 40 per year with the respective countries. By contrast, since 2001, China has only conducted eleven joint exercises or training events in Asia and with only a limited number of partners. See Table 2 for the list of joint exercises, which have occurred in Asia and that the PLA has participated in. According to a Xinhua article, it was not until 2002 that “China set the principle of gradual participation in multilateral military exercises to broaden its security cooperation with other countries.”⁴³ In Asia, these countries, thus far, include India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Thailand. Exercise themes were mostly limited to search and rescue or anti-terrorism.

Table 2. China’s Joint Military Exercises with Asian Countries Since 2001

DATE	EXERCISE	COUNTRIES INVOLVED
2002	Anti-terrorist Exercise	China, Kyrgyzstan
August 2003	Shanghai Cooperation Organization Exercise—“Coalition 2003”	China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan
October 2003	Sino-Pakistani Search and Rescue Exercise	China, Pakistan
November 2003	Sino-Indian Naval Exercise	China, India
August 2004	Sino-Pakistani Counter-Terrorism Exercise	China, Pakistan
August 2005	Peace Mission 2005	China, Russia
November 2005	Sino-Pakistani Search and Rescue Exercise	China, Pakistan
December 2005	Sino-Indian Search and Rescue Exercise	China, India
December 2005	Sino-Thai Search and Rescue Exercise	China, Thailand
September 2006	Sino-Tajikistani Counter-Terrorism Exercise – “Cooperation 2006”	China, Tajikistan
December 2006	Sino-Pakistani Counter-Terrorism Exercise—“Friendship 2006”	China, Pakistan
March 2007	Multilateral Maritime Exercise of WPNS	
July 2007	“Strike2007” Joint Army Training in Special Operations	China, Thailand
August 2007	Shanghai Cooperation Organization Exercise—“Peace Mission2007”	China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan
December 2007	“Hand-in-Hand2007” Joint Counter-terrorism Training	China, India

⁴³ Lixi Dong and Ran Rong, “Joint Military Drills Draw Attention Worldwide,” *China Facts and Figures*, December 14, 2003, <http://www.china.org.cn/english/international/82438.htm> (accessed December 21, 2008).

The PRC possessed a distinct advantage over the United States in Asian regional forums participation. China was an active member of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), multiple forums involving the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and other regional forums as well. The SCO served as a platform for symposiums, agreements and cooperation on anti-terrorism related issues between China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. In addition, China engaged other Asian countries including Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam through the 10+3 (ASEAN plus China, Japan and the Republic of Korea) and 10+1 (ASEAN plus China) forums. These forums were used as venues to conduct security talks on numerous occasions. China also participated in the East Asian Summit (EAS) in 2005. EAS included the 10+3 members and India, Australia and New Zealand. The 10+3, 10+1, and EAS forums all served as vehicles for non-traditional security issues.⁴⁴ Additional Asian forums that China participated in included the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia (CICA), Council on Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region (CSCAP), and Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue (NEACD). Participation in Asian regional forums by the United States was less active. The only forum that the United States had membership status in was ARF, which includes numerous non-Asian members such as Canada, the European Union (EU), and Australia. The U.S. also participates in a couple of other forums such as NEACD and CSCAP, but in total, China is still more involved in Asia via regional forums.

3. Professional Military Education Exchanges

The United States and China both routinely sent military officers abroad and received foreign military officers through various education exchange programs including PME, seminars, and symposiums. Both countries appeared to have maintained healthy levels of activities in this field. The difference was in the principal direction of

⁴⁴ Department of Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China, *China's Foreign Affairs 2006 Edition* (Beijing: World Affairs Press, 2006), 36.

information flow. The U.S. military was more entrenched in the business of propagating education rather than receiving. The PLA, on the other hand, appeared to exert more analogous efforts between propagating and receiving education.

Both the U.S. and Chinese militaries sent officers abroad, but the scope of activities the officers participated in, while abroad, was not equally stout. U.S. officers not only received education abroad, but also led training for foreign militaries. In receiving education, U.S. military officers attended PME in Asian partner nations including India, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore.⁴⁵ In propagating education, U.S. military officers were sent abroad to teach seminars on topics such as medicine, law, logistics, and security.⁴⁶

The PLA only sent officers abroad to receive education. According to China's 2004 Defense White Papers, the PLA in recent years, "has sent over 1,000 military students to more than 20 countries, and 19 military colleges and universities in China have established inter-collegiate exchange relations with their counterparts in 25 countries."⁴⁷ The numbers increased slightly in the two following years. As the 2006 Defense White papers reported, "Over 500 military personnel have been dispatched to study in more than 20 countries."⁴⁸

In addition to actively sending officers abroad, both the United States and China also received officers from various foreign countries through its military education institutions. For the U.S. military, these institutions were located both in the contingent United States (CONUS) and abroad in regional centers. In the CONUS, foreign officers

⁴⁵ United States Air Force Personnel Command, "Intermediate/Senior Developmental Education Programs," *Officer Developmental Education*, May 2, 2008, http://ask.afpc.randolph.af.mil/main_content.asp?prods1=1&prods2=244&prods3=246&p_faqid=6025 (accessed November 12, 2008).

⁴⁶ Detailed yearly activities with individual countries can be found on the IMET website at <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/rpt/fmtrpt/> (December 13, 2008).

⁴⁷ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2004*, December 2004, <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20041227/index.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008).

⁴⁸ The PLA did not provide detailed breakdowns by country of where officers were sent. The only information available came from the "Military Exchanges and Cooperation" section of the 2006 Defense White papers - People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2006*, December 29, 2006, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/wp2006.html#2> (accessed August 17, 2008).

attended academic institutions such as the Naval Postgraduate School, Army Command and General Staff Officer College, Naval War College, Air Force Air Command and Staff College, and Air Force Squadron Officer School. In addition, foreign officers also attended training courses specific to specialty skills such as languages, logistics, and parachuting. Outside of CONUS, the U.S. military received foreign officers at its regional training centers including the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies in Hawaii and the George C. Marshall Center in Germany.⁴⁹ While attending U.S.-operated schools and training centers, foreign military members studied and trained side-by-side with U.S. counterparts.

The PLA also received a large number of foreign officers at its various academic institutions. From 2003 to 2004, 1,245 military personnel from 91 countries studied in Chinese military colleges and universities. Moreover, “officers from 44 of these countries have participated in the fifth and sixth International Symposium Course hosted by the PLA National Defense University.”⁵⁰ The volume of foreign officers studying in China increased in the 2005 to 2006 period. During this time, over 2,000 military personnel from more than 140 countries studied in military schools.⁵¹ One difference to note on foreign military members studying in China is that they are often isolated and are not mainlined with PLA counterparts during education or training.

4. Non-traditional Security Cooperation

The span of non-traditional security cooperation encompasses activities surrounding counter-terrorism, peacekeeping, and humanitarian assistance. Within these activities, the behaviors of the U.S. and Chinese militaries demonstrated both similarities and differences. First, with respect to counter-terrorism activities, both militaries showed increased activity levels, albeit with different partners. Second, in peacekeeping

⁴⁹ Detailed yearly activities with individual countries can be found on the IMET website at <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/rpt/fmtrpt/> (December 13, 2008).

⁵⁰ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2004*, December 2004, <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20041227/index.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008).

⁵¹ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2006*; RAND Corporation, “Defining U.S. Interests in Central Asia,” 2005, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG338.pdf (accessed November 12, 2008).

operations within Asia, China demonstrated higher levels of commitment. Finally, while both countries showed activism in supporting humanitarian assistance and disaster relief efforts, the U.S. military not only had higher levels of involvement in each country, it was also involved in more countries.

Counter-terrorism cooperation activities dramatically increased after 2001. For the U.S. military, the events of September 11, 2001 clearly increased the focus on counter-terrorism. Actions that precipitated from the new focus on counter-terrorism included setting up substantial operations in Karshi-Khanabad, Uzbekistan, and Manas, Kyrgyzstan to support OEF operations. The U.S. military also conducted a smaller refueling missions based out of Ashqabad, Turkmenistan.⁵² In addition to these measures, the U.S. military introduced multiple counter-terror training programs at home and abroad, conducted Operation Enduring Freedom-Philippines under the leadership of Joint Task Force (JTF) 510, and strengthened cooperative relationships with countries such as India, Indonesia and Pakistan.

China was also very active in proliferating counter-terrorism measures. According to China's 2002 Defense White Papers, China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan founded the SCO in June of 2001. In June of the following year, the heads of state of the six countries signed three important legal and political documents—the Charter of the SCO, the Agreement on a Regional Anti-Terrorist Agency and the Declaration of the Heads of State of the SCO Member Countries at the SCO St. Petersburg Summit.⁵³ In 2004, “the SCO Regional Anti-Terrorism Structure was brought into operation.”⁵⁴ Also in 2004, “China held the fourth meeting of the China-Russia Counter-Terrorism Working Group.”⁵⁵

⁵² RAND Corporation, “Defining U.S. Interests in Central Asia,” 2005, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG338.pdf (accessed November 12, 2008), 41.

⁵³ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, “China's National Defense in 2002,” December 2002, <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20021209/index.htm> (accessed November 5, 2008).

⁵⁴ Department of Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China, *China's Foreign Affairs 2005 Edition* (Beijing: World Affairs Press, 2005), 62.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 361.

In the realm of conducting peacekeeping operations in Asia, China has the distinct advantage by traditional accounting standards. These standards do not account for U.S. forces in South Korea as peacekeepers. In 2006, the United States still had approximately 35,000 U.S. troops serving in South Korea under bilateral U.S.-Republic of Korea agreements and U.N. authority. Although this was technically “peacekeeping,” U.S. troop deployment to South Korea has long been counted as a standard U.S. forward presence.⁵⁶ This accounting anomaly aside, the U.S. military had no peacekeeping presence in Asia. By 2004, very few U.S. military personnel were involved with peacekeeping worldwide. A report to Congress in 2006 indicated that only twenty-eight U.S. military personnel were serving in five UN peacekeeping or related operations, none of which was in Asia.⁵⁷

In contrast, China had a significant military commitment to peacekeeping in Asia. China vigorously advertises the PLA’s involvement in peacekeeping operations. Beijing often highlights that of the five permanent members of the United Nations’ Security Council, China provides the largest number of peacekeeping forces. While the majority of Chinese peacekeeping forces were deployed to Africa, a notable number—899 PLA troops—were also dispatched within Asia. China’s 2004 and 2006 defense White Papers indicated that 800 troops and ninety-seven observers were in Cambodia operating under the UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC). The remaining two were observers of the UN Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT).⁵⁸

The U.S. military participated in humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations on a larger scale. The U.S. forces conducted operations with higher frequency and in more countries than the PLA. In addition to being involved in the relief efforts after all major natural disasters, the U.S. military also conducted scores of other missions. PACOM TSCMIS records indicated that the highest number of interactions occurred with

⁵⁶ Nina M. Serafino, *Peacekeeping and Related Stability Operations: Issues of U.S. Military Involvement* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2006), 4.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2004*, December 2004, <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20041227/index.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008), Appendix VI; and People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2006*, December 29, 2006, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/wp2006.html#2> (accessed August 17, 2008), Appendix V.

Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, the Philippines and Viet Nam. The instances of cooperation from 2005 to 2007 alone totaled thirty-nine with Cambodia, thirty-three with Indonesia, twenty-five with Laos, forty-two with the Philippines, and thirty-two with Viet Nam.⁵⁹

China's involvement in similar operations occurred on a much smaller scale. The 2004 Defense White papers did not even reference such activities. This changed in the 2006 publication where the PLA was described as actively participating in international disaster relief efforts. The document stated that the PLA contributed to disaster relief in Asia by supporting rescue operations after the Indian Ocean tsunami and the earthquakes in Pakistan and Indonesia. In addition, the PLA has also "conducted search and rescue operations, provided medical assistance, and provided relief materials to disaster stricken countries."⁶⁰ Beijing stopped short of elaborating on a specific number of occurrences, which judging from detailed accounts of other numbers, may be an indication of a lower level of involvement.

5. Summary

Both the United States and PRC have conducted wide arrays of military diplomacy activities throughout Asia since 2001. In conducting a comparative assessment of such activities, the most apparent observation was that the PLA's volume of overall diplomacy activities fell short of similar U.S. efforts. Beyond this trend, both militaries displayed unique preferences for methods and regularities of engagements. Examining both U.S. and PRC records on military diplomacy since 2001 also revealed additional patterns. U.S. activities exhibited three distinctive characteristics. First, the U.S. military engagement efforts extended to all Asian countries. Second, the engagement efforts were executed through diversified activities with a well-balanced employment between all tools of engagement. Third, the frequency of military diplomacy activities was especially high among select security partners such as Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Thailand, and the Philippines.

⁵⁹ See Appendix B for summary of PACOM TSCMIS Yearly Assessments.

⁶⁰ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2006*, December 29, 2006, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/wp2006.html#2> (accessed August 17, 2008).

The PLA also engaged most of the Asian countries by conducting a wide range of activities. Although the quantity of activities was not as robust as the U.S. levels, there were still some definitive patterns surrounding activity choices. First, state-to-state military protocols and counter-terrorism cooperation received particular emphasis as the tools of choice for fostering military-to-military relations. Second, the PLA surpassed the U.S. military in some activities.

Table 3 below offers a comparative advantage overview across all military diplomacy activities this project examined. Overall, U.S. military diplomacy efforts showed greater potency in the majority of activities. However, the PLA did demonstrate aptitude for two particular activities—participating in regional forums and peacekeeping operations. The PLA also showed competency equivalent to the U.S. military in the realms of participating security consultations and dialogues, and conducting state-to-state military protocols. These instances suggest that while the U.S. military may still have the overall military diplomacy advantage in Asia (from an activity volume perspective), the PLA does have footholds in limited activities and is also capable of keeping up with the U.S. military in others.

Table 3. Comparative Advantage across All Activities

ACTIVITY TYPE	U.S. ADVANTAGE	PRC ADVANTAGE	EQUAL	COMMENTS
<i>Strategic</i>				
Consultations and Strategic Dialogues			X	Equal efforts
Arms Transfers	X			Larger Scale and more occurrences
Military Exchanges	X			Engagement with more countries
<i>Regional</i>				
State-to-State Military Protocols			X	Equal efforts
Joint Exercises or Training Events	X			Far more occurrences
Regional Forums		X		More membership, more involvement
<i>PME Exchange</i>				
Send Abroad	X			Learn and teach

ACTIVITY TYPE	U.S. ADVANTAGE	PRC ADVANTAGE	EQUAL	COMMENTS
Receive Foreign	X			CONUS and regional centers
<i>Non-Traditional Sec Cooperation</i>				
Counter-Terrorism	X			Higher levels of commitment, e.g. basing
Peacekeeping		X		No U.S. presence in Asia
Humanitarian Assistance	X			Larger scale operations

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. GENERAL TRENDS ANALYSIS

The previous chapter highlighted differences and similarities by conducting a comparative assessment of U.S. and PRC military diplomatic activities. The assessment yielded some general trends. First, the scale of operations in the realm of military diplomacy was drastically different—U.S. activity levels far exceeded that of corresponding Chinese efforts. Second, while both militaries interacted broadly with Asian countries, each had conspicuous preferences for maintaining security relationships with particular countries—the United States had high levels of defense-centric involvements with Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines, while China showed relative preferences for Pakistan, Russia, Burma, and North Korea. Third, the United States and China each employed specific diplomatic tools to varying extents—the U.S. military dominated in all diplomatic activities except for four: consultations and strategic dialogues; state-to-state military protocols; regional forum participation; and peacekeeping operations. This chapter analyzes the above-mentioned trends more closely in order to explore potential explanations for the variations and examine how these trends may affect the future of U.S. military diplomacy efforts in Asia. The examination concludes that differences in overall activity level can be attributed to differences in military capabilities; that national interests drive preferences for engagement partners; and that there is no immediate threat to U.S. military diplomacy in Asia because the U.S. capacity to conduct military diplomacy in the region still exceeds that of the PLA.

There are four sections in this chapter. The first section attempts to draw a link between U.S. and Chinese military capabilities and differences in overall military diplomacy activity levels. The second section closely examines the context surrounding individual military-to-military relationships between the U.S. and PLA forces and their respective preferred partners. The third section assesses the military diplomacy venues in which the United States did not dominate and estimate the possible implications. Finally, the fourth takes note of some important points to contemplate in calculating the impact of military diplomacy.

A. OVERALL ACTIVITY LEVEL DISPARITY

As noted in the previous chapter, the most glaring difference between U.S. and Chinese military diplomacy in Asia stems from the different levels of activities between the two countries. The sheer volume of U.S. military diplomacy easily overshadows similar Chinese efforts in a parallel comparison. This disparity in activity levels results from the superpower capabilities of the United States, which is more effective than the PLA in facilitating wide-ranging military diplomacy activities.

The term “superpower” was coined in 1944 by William T. R. Fox, an American foreign policy professor, in his book *The Superpowers: The United States, Britain and the Soviet Union—Their Responsibility for Peace*. Fox identified superpowers as states that occupied the highest status in the world because they could challenge and fight each other on a global scale. In 2005, Alice Miller, a leading China expert and professor at the Naval Postgraduate School, further defined *superpower* as “a country that has the capacity to project dominating power and influence anywhere in the world, and sometimes, in more than one region of the globe at a time, and so may plausibly attain the status of global hegemon.” According to Miller, the basic components of superpower stature may be measured along four axes: economic, military, political, and cultural (or “soft”).⁶¹ With respect to the above definitions, the PLA’s capabilities certainly do not entitle the PRC to superpower status.

While China’s military modernization has made significant strides, improvement of its capabilities are limited. China’s military modernization efforts appear to be consumed with pursuing “selective pockets of excellence.” In Miller’s view, these priorities are:

- Acquiring “green water” naval and air support capacities to defend China’s coastal provinces, now the geographic backbone of China’s industrial economy
- Establishing credible military capacities to win conflicts quickly and decisively on China’s long land borders in Asia, where China still has several unresolved boundary disputes

⁶¹ Alice L. Miller, *Hoover Digest: Research and Opinion on Public Policy*, 2005, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/digest/2938796.html> (accessed February 11, 2009).

- Defending China in what is arguably the most heavily militarized region in the world, which includes five of the world's seven declared nuclear states (as well as South Korea, Japan, and Taiwan, all of which could rapidly develop nuclear weapons, and North Korea, which may already have them)
- Compelling resolution of the Taiwan question either politically or by outright military force—even in the event of American intervention on Taipei's behalf—as well as Chinese claims in the South China Sea (the Spratly Islands) on terms acceptable to Beijing
- Preserving the credibility of China's second-strike nuclear deterrent against a strategic first strike⁶²

Developing robust military diplomacy capabilities, even though a possible emphasis for the PLA, does not appear to be a top “selective pocket of excellence” of the PLA.⁶³

As a superpower, the United States projects a great amount of influence in Asia through the use of its military. As a baseline, the U.S. military has a significant presence based in Japan and South Korea. According to the September 2007 DoD active duty military personnel strength figures, there were 32,803 and 27,014 military personnel stationed in Japan and South Korea respectively. In addition, there were 12,278 troops afloat on U.S. Naval assets in the East Asia and Pacific region.⁶⁴ Moreover, the U.S. military also had significant numbers of troops in Thailand (96), Philippines (95), Singapore (125) and Russia (72).

While China has expanded its military outreach through the establishment of attaché offices abroad, the PLA's overall presence or activity level outside of China's borders are minuscule when compared to the extensive U.S. military presence throughout various Asian countries. The PLA is still too preoccupied with modernizing its forces, defending its borders, and preparing for a conflict with Taiwan to divert limited military

⁶² Alice L. Miller, *Hoover Digest: Research and Opinion on Public Policy*, 2005, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/digest/2938796.html> (accessed February 11, 2009).

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Department of Defense, “Active Duty Military Personnel Strengths by Regional Area and by Country (309A),” *Military Personnel Statistics*, September 30, 2007, <http://siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/MILITARY/Miltop.htm> (accessed January 15, 2009).

resources effectively toward sustaining large-scale diplomacy efforts. This lack of capabilities is what accounts for the overall diplomacy activity level differential between the U.S. military and the PLA.

B. STRATEGIC PARTNERS

When looking beyond the overall presence and activity levels, both the U.S. and Chinese militaries demonstrated distinctive levels of association with different Asian countries. This section analyzes the defining pillars of each military's diplomacy efforts by examining interactions with strategic defense partners. Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand were the countries that had the most defense-centric interactions with the United States. These high levels of interactions with the U.S. military suggest a strong willingness to interact with the United States. These countries will therefore be considered strategic partners of the United States. Pakistan, Russia, Burma and North Korea had high levels of defense-related interactions with China and will be considered China's strategic partners. This section more closely examines the security relationships Washington and Beijing maintained with their respective strategic partners by evaluating each relationship against the background of political aims. The assumption is that because military relations are subordinate to political relations, examining the political climate surrounding current relationships can provide insights into future relationship prospects. This process reveals that aside from Thailand and Pakistan, which were more ambiguous in committing to either the United States or China, other Asian countries that are either U.S. or Chinese strategic partners are tied to either Washington or Beijing through various strategic interests or political objectives. Changing the context of these relationships would require substantial efforts.

1. U.S.-Japan Security Relations

Although the relationship has waxed and waned throughout the years, Japan has been a key ally of the U.S. military in Asia since the conclusion of World War II. In recent years, Japan's concerns over Chinese military modernization have further solidified the U.S.-Japan security relationship. As a RAND report noted, Japanese

officials have become “increasingly willing to cite their concerns about Chinese military modernization publicly in official statements and planning documents.”⁶⁵ These actions are prominent indicators of Japan’s intentions to embrace the United States more tightly as a part of its defense posture towards China.

The Japanese defense focus appeared to have shifted toward China by the mid-2000s. Since the end of the Cold War, Japanese officials have generally planned against North Korea, not China, as the primary threat.⁶⁶ However, at the end of 2005, the leader of the Democratic Party of Japan, Maehara Seiji, suggested to an American audience that China is a “real threat.”⁶⁷ Then Foreign Minister Aso Taro, echoed Maehara’s sentiments by reiterating that China’s large increases in defense spending are a “considerable threat.”⁶⁸ Furthermore, the Japanese Defense Agency Director General Nukaga Fukushima stated in January of 2006 that Japan’s security threats come from China in addition to North Korea.⁶⁹ From a realist approach, the collective willingness of top Japanese defense officials to openly discuss China as a potential threat suggests that Japan would be more willing to embrace a closer relationship with the U.S. versus the Chinese military.

Maintaining a close relationship with the U.S. military is consistent with the interests of Tokyo. From the perspective of the RAND Report “Pacific Currents: The responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China’s Rise,” close cooperation between U.S. and Japanese military forces is key to a healthy U.S.–Japanese alliance. According to the report, Japan’s security relationship with the United States is

⁶⁵ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China’s Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 48.

⁶⁶ Former JDA Director Ishiba Shigeru barely mentioned China in his book, *National Defense*, focusing instead on Korea and hypothetical threats. Ishiba Shigeru, *Kokubou (National Defense)* (Tokyo: Shinchousha, 2005).

⁶⁷ Seiji Maehara, “Make Them Trigger Revitalization of Party,” *FBIS-JPP20051214026004*, trans. Foreign Broadcast Information Service (December 14, 2005).

⁶⁸ Taro Aso, *Foreign Minister Statement* at press conference (Tokyo: Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, December 22, 2005).

⁶⁹ Nukaga Fukushima, “Japan’s Defense Policy and International Peace Cooperation Activities,” *Speech Delivered to the Royal United Service Institute for Defense and Security Studies* (London, January 11, 2006).

probably one of the most important variables shaping Tokyo's security posture because a robust military relationship "will work to improve Japanese capabilities (particularly the human elements) more quickly and effectively than would otherwise be possible and, at the same time, will minimize pressures for the development of the military capabilities (especially nuclear capabilities) that would most alarm neighbors."⁷⁰

In addition to the U.S.—centric issues influencing the U.S.-Japan security relationship, there are also some China-centric issues that come into play. In recent years, Beijing's opposition to Japanese officials' visit to the Yasukuni shrine has been a big issue of contention. The way prominent Japanese leaders have approached the issue has had obvious influences on the climate of overall Sino-Japanese relations, which offers a commensurate gauge of the military-to-military relations. Moreover, the territorial dispute over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands, while unlikely to lead to an all out conflict, remains a point of friction for the Sino-Japanese relationship. While the Yasukuni and Senkaku/Diaoyu issues have largely been points of contention, regional developments on the Korean peninsula have most recently offered Beijing and Tokyo a chance for cooperation. Tokyo and Beijing have collectively emphasized the common interests of denuclearizing the Korean peninsula.⁷¹

Taken altogether, the contrast in Japan's levels of military-to-military interaction with the U.S. military and PLA appear to be consistent with Tokyo's overall political interests. As long as what frames these interests remains in place, the likelihood for drastic shifts of military-to-military interaction will be diminutive. For now, the robust relationship the U.S. military has with Japanese counterparts does not appear to be susceptible to challenge by the JSDF's interactions with the PLA.

2. U.S.-Korea Security Relations

Similar to Japan, South Korea has been a stable ally of the United States in recent decades. For a significant portion of these decades, South Korea's security concerns

⁷⁰ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 58.

⁷¹ Ibid., 59.

evolved around potential conflict with its immediate neighbor, North Korea. However, in the last two decades, international events such as the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the North Korean economy have caused shifts in South Korean long-range defense planning.⁷² New planning efforts show evidence of shifting toward broader concerns—notably, rapidly advancing military technologies and developing more self-reliant defense capabilities for the period after Korea’s unification, commensurate with that of a regional power.⁷³ In the effort to realize these goals, South Korea sees its relations with the United States as a necessity and hence continues to offer strong support for a close security relationship with the United States.

South Korea’s desire to upgrade military technologies rapidly has been markedly apparent. Starting in the mid-1990s, the defense leadership has placed a high priority on procuring advanced command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence systems; early warning and long-range strike capabilities; a blue-water navy; and naval air-defense capabilities.⁷⁴ According to documents accidentally posted on the website of South Korea’s weapon procurement office, South Korea’s strategic weapon plans for the middle term (15 years) include developing nuclear-powered submarines, long-range fighters, and unmanned aerial surveillance vehicles.⁷⁵ Analysts from RAND estimate that these plans are intended “less to counter anticipated North Korean aggression than to develop an elite force capable of waging high-tech warfare more broadly in the twenty – first century.”⁷⁶

In addition to hardware upgrades, South Korea’s defense leadership also plans to revamp its forces. The recent Ministry of National Defense (MND) military transformation plan, *Defense Reform 2020*, calls for dramatic force structure changes by

⁷² Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China’s Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 86.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ For summary, see Jane’s, “South Korea at a Glance, Jane’s Sentinel Security Assessment—China and Northeast Asia,” (January 13, 2006).

⁷⁵ Dae-woong Jin, “Junior Officials Blamed for Secrets Leak,” *The Korea Herald* (Seoul, January 12, 2006).

⁷⁶ Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China’s Rise*, 86.

the year 2020. These changes include reducing the number of army divisions from forty-seven to twenty and cutting military personnel back from 681,000 to 500,000, which aim to “improve the forces’ qualitative capabilities while reducing their size and the number of weapon systems.”⁷⁷ This leaning of military forces appears to be focused on keeping up with global military transformation trends beyond simply preparing to fight North Korea’s massive army or any other specific potential adversary.⁷⁸ South Korea’s true military intentions, in the view of many knowledgeable observers both inside and outside of the country, are to develop military capabilities in order to be taken seriously as a regional actor.⁷⁹

In the interest of pursuing modernization while receiving steadfast security assurances, Seoul is likely to continue to engage the U.S. military as its security ally. The South Korean military is currently unprepared to undertake independently its security needs. This was evident from the political leadership’s language. South Korea leaders employed the term “cooperative self-reliant national defense” to describe its defense policy. A South Korean scholar succinctly defined this term to mean “cooperation with the United States, not cooperative security with its neighbors.”⁸⁰

Although China has some direct influence on South Korea’s defense policy via military-to-military interaction, the defense relationship between the two countries remains predominantly superficial. South Korea and China have thus far embarked on three types of military-to-military interactions:

⁷⁷ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China’s Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 87.

⁷⁸ For analysis of *Defense Reform 2020*, see Bruce W. Bennett, A Brief Analysis of the Republic of Korea’s Defense Reform Plan, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, OP-165-OSD, 2006; Hong Kyudok, “The Strategic Linkage Between the Republic of Korea’s Defense Reform 2020 and Changing Security Environment,” *Korea Focus*, April 2006; and Han Yong-sup, “Analyzing South Korea’s Defense Reform 2020,” *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, Spring 2006.

⁷⁹ For detailed discussions, see Open Source Center, OSC Analysis 08 June: ROKAF Upgrade, Modernization Continues Despite Challenges, June 8, 2007; Jin Dae-woong, “South Korea Eyes High-Tech Navy,” *The Korea Herald*, June 4, 2007; Jung Sung-ki, “‘Peace Island’ in Dilemma Over Naval Base,” *The Korea Times*, July 17, 2006.

⁸⁰ Taik-young Hamm, “The Self-Reliant National Defense of South Korea and the Future of the U.S.–ROK Alliance,” *Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainable Development Northeast Asia Peace and Security Project*, January 20, 2006, The Self-Reliant National Defense of South Korea and the Future of the U.S.–ROK Alliance (accessed January 13, 2009).

- High-level exchanges;
- Periodic working-level and information exchanges; and
- Exchanges of military research institute students, athletes, and other personnel.⁸¹

South Korea used these kinds of activities to both “educate the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) about South Korean perceptions on important issues and to address practical problems between the two militaries.”⁸²

The current bilateral military relations between South Korea and China might best be described as “both thin and one sided.”⁸³ Activities remain very formal at the high-level exchanges and the two militaries sometimes lack full cooperation.⁸⁴ Military-to-military relations do not include signs of mature bilateral military relationships such as significant arms sales or joint military exercises. Present military interactions appear to only take place for the sake of “improving the general atmosphere in South Korean–Chinese political relations [rather] than on addressing concrete security problems and improving prospects for peace.”⁸⁵

Evaluating the context surrounding South Korea’s security relationship with both the United States and China offers a good explanation for the healthier levels of military-to-military interactions between South Korean and U.S. forces. Even though South Korea’s security relationship with the PRC is improving, its military interactions with the PLA still fall short of robust levels. Insofar as future prospects are concerned, South Korea’s security objectives suggest that it will continue to embrace the U.S. military as a close security ally while keeping the PLA in the periphery.

⁸¹Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 89-90.

⁸² Ibid., 90.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ For example, South Korea, even after expressing great interest, reportedly received no information about the joint China-Russia military exercise, which focused on a potential emergency on the Korean peninsula. Kwi-kun Kim, “Military Keeps Watchful Eye on How China-Russia Joint Exercise Proceeds—‘No Information on Military Exercise Provided to South Korea,’” *Yonhap News Agency*, August 17, 2005.

⁸⁵ Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise*, 90.

3. U.S.–Philippine Security Relations

The United States is presently the key defense ally for the Philippines. The U.S.-Philippine security relationship dramatically cooled when U.S. basing agreements were terminated in 1992 and U.S. forces withdrew from the Philippines. However, the 1995 Mischief Reef incident between the Philippines and China prompted Manila to rebuild defense ties with the United States. After the rapprochement, the Republic of the Philippines relied on the U.S. military to provide stability in the South China Sea. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 acted as a catalyst to congeal the security relationship further by enhancing military-to-military relations under the umbrella of counterterrorism cooperation. Manila's primary focus in the short-term (through 2010) is to fight internal threats vis-à-vis anti-terrorism cooperation with the U.S. military. Looking beyond 2010, the Filipino leadership aims to solicit U.S. aid in rebuilding its maritime and air forces.⁸⁶ While Sino-Philippine security relations have improved in recent years, Manila's current security concerns and future security objectives are likely to continue fostering strong military-to-military ties with the United States.

The rapprochement between the United States and the Philippines offered the respective military of each country opportunities to shore up relations with its counterpart. For instance, the 1998 U.S.–Philippine Visiting Forces Agreement permitted the resumption of U.S.–Philippine combined military exercises, and the 2002 Mutual Logistics Support Agreement provided the structure for reciprocal logistic support.⁸⁷ Once a close-knit U.S.-Philippine security relationship was reestablished, Manila turned its security focus inward, towards threats within its borders.⁸⁸

Manila identifies domestic terrorist/criminal groups as its main security threat. Groups such as the Communist Party of the Philippines New People's Army, the Abu Sayyaf Group, the Misurai Breakaway Group, and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front, all

⁸⁶ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 117.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 118.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 116.

cause security concerns for Manila.⁸⁹ These concerns were the motivation for the government's decision to cooperate with the U.S. military in counterterrorism measures after 2001. Manila facilitated U.S. overflights and transients in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. In return, the U.S. Military provided antiterrorism training and logistical/tactical support for the Philippine army as a part of counterterrorism operations on Mindanao, eventually named Operation Enduring Freedom-Philippines (OEF-P).⁹⁰

Since the launching of OEF-P, U.S. security assistance to the Philippines has dramatically increased. Assistance levels have not reached such heights since the withdrawal of the U.S. bases in 1992. Foreign military financing went from \$2 million in fiscal year 2002 to a sustained level of \$19.0 million or more in subsequent years.⁹¹ In addition, the Filipino army also received significant transfers of defense articles from the United States. Given the opportunity, Manila would like to receive even greater security assistance.

Beyond 2010, the Republic of the Philippines would like to seek U.S. assistance to rebuild Philippine air and naval capabilities. In concentrating on its internal threats, Manila made a strategic decision to neglect its maritime and air capabilities in order to pool resources for its army.⁹² Assuming this strategy will prove effective and there will be a reduction of internal threat, the Philippine armed forces plans to reestablish a capability to defend against external threats.⁹³ When such a time arrives, Manila will

⁸⁹ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008).

⁹⁰ Starting in January 2002, Joint Task Force 510 deployed to the Philippines to conduct Operation Enduring Freedom-Philippines. Forces included Special Forces advisors, various instructors, and associated air support.

⁹¹ Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise*, 118.

⁹² For detailed discussion of examples, Rand; Ibid., 116-117.

⁹³ "Radios, Helicopters for the Philippines," *Defense Industry Daily* (June 12, 2007); Beting Laygo Dolor, "China Gives Military Aid to Philippines," *Philippine News Manila* (March 14, 2005).

most likely look to Washington instead of China for assistance since “despite official assertions that there are no external threats—China remains a factor in Philippine strategic thinking and defense planning.”⁹⁴

Until the Philippine armed forces develop a military capability to confront the PLA independently during incidents similar to Mischief Reef, diplomacy will remain the tool of choice for conducting military engagements. With this in mind, the prospects for enhanced military relations between China and the Philippines have been improving in recent years. Military engagements have included exchanges between senior and working-level officials, annual meetings at the minister of defense level, ship visits, and the PRC even provided a small amount of military assistance to the Philippines.⁹⁵ The climate especially improved after the Hu-Arroyo summit in September 2004 where the leaders agreed to initiate regular high-level talks on defense cooperation, increase military exchange visits, and swap intelligence on transnational threats.⁹⁶

Despite the improved relations between the Philippine armed forces and the PLA, the U.S. military should not have significant concerns about the erosion of U.S.-Philippine military relations. Improving military-to-military relations with China may have helped the Philippine government avert conflict with the PLA for the time being, but does not offer any long-term security guarantees or enables the large-scale military modernization required to develop an effective Philippine military. The Philippine armed forces require aid with internal security threats in the short-term and military modernization in the long-term. An intimate relationship with the U.S. military presents the best opportunities for realizing such goals. Therefore, Manila is compelled to continue endorsing a robust military-to-military relationship with the United States.

⁹⁴ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 117.

⁹⁵ For details on China's military assistance to the Philippines, see Beting Laygo Dolor, “China Gives Military Aid to Philippines,” *Philippine News* (Manila, March 14, 2005); Ian Storey, “Creeping Assertiveness: China, the Philippines, and the South China Sea Dispute,” *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, April 1999: 6-9; “China, the Philippines Hold Defense Consultations in Beijing,” *People's Daily* (Beijing, October 10, 2006).

⁹⁶ Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise*, 120.

4. U.S.-Singapore Security Relations

Singapore's security relationship with the United States displays all the signs of mature military-to-military relations. Arms transfers, training, basing, and exchanges at different levels are all elements of military-to-military relations between the two countries. For Singapore, these elements serve as reinforcements for the expectation that the United States will remain engaged in the region in order to perpetuate stability. Barring any catastrophic circumstances capable of throwing the current status quo into disarray, the healthy military relationship between the two countries should endure in the foreseeable future.

The United States has a big role in facilitating Singapore's weapons modernization process. This modernization process includes both procurement and training. For instance, Singapore purchased the AIM-120 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles from the United States and also received the training and software to arm its F-16 aircraft with the missiles.⁹⁷ This instance also demonstrates a substantial level of trust as the missiles themselves were kept in the United States in order to adhere to the U.S. policy of not being the first to "introduce sophisticated military technology into the region."⁹⁸ Another advance weapons system Singapore acquired from the United States is the AH-64D Apache attack helicopters with the Longbow system. The Apache "rapidly and automatically searches, detects, locates, classifies, and prioritizes multiple moving and stationary land, sea, and air targets in clear and adverse weather conditions."⁹⁹ Similar to the AIM-120 missiles, the Apaches are also kept in the United States, where the Singaporean crews train on the system with the Arizona National Guard.¹⁰⁰

In addition to being linked by the transferring of and training on advanced weapons systems, the Singaporean and U.S. defense relationship is also connected

⁹⁷ The AIM-120 is a high-supersonic, day, night, all-weather, beyond-visual-range (BVR), fire-and-forget air-to-air missile.

⁹⁸ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 182.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

through basing arrangements. Singapore is home to the U.S. Navy Logistic Group West Pacific and the U.S. Air Force 497th Combat Training Squadron. Moreover, the Changi Naval Base can accommodate a U.S. aircraft carrier, and consistently receives port visits from U.S. ships.¹⁰¹

Singapore embraces the above-described security ties with the U.S. military in order to maintain stability in the region. This stability exists on two levels. On the first level, Singapore is concerned with what defense analyst Tim Huxley calls the “grand regional level.”¹⁰² According to a RAND study, “Singapore relies on extra-regional powers—primarily the United States—to maintain the balance of power and prevent a larger power from dominating the smaller Asian states.”¹⁰³ The next level is Singapore’s concern with its immediate vicinity. On this level, Singapore relies mostly on the defense capacity generated by its own resources to protect against potential aggression or regional domination by its neighbors, primarily Malaysia or Indonesia.¹⁰⁴ The assistance of the U.S. military is indispensable on both levels.

While an assured security relationship with United States carries the preponderance of focus in Singapore’s defense plan, the plan also seeks to improve military relations with China. From Singapore’s perspective, “military engagement with China is part and parcel of its approach of enmeshing China—and its military—into a web of regional relationships that fosters the emergence of a China that does not act coercively or otherwise upset regional stability.”¹⁰⁵ Singapore’s defense relations with China have indeed improved in recent years. During Defense Minister Teo Chee Hean’s visit to China in November 2005, the two sides agreed to improve defense ties by establishing annual defense policy dialogues at the Ministry of Defense Permanent

¹⁰¹ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 182.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 180.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ Tim Huxley, *Defending the Lion City: The Armed Forces of Singapore* (Londo: Allen & Unwin, 2001), 33-37.

¹⁰⁵ Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise*, 185.

Secretary level and stepping up high-level military visits and port calls. In addition, the two governments also agreed to cooperate in non-traditional security issues such as international humanitarian assistance, disaster relief and peacekeeping operations.¹⁰⁶ Minister Teo also extended scholarship offers for PLA officers to attend graduate degree studies in Singapore.¹⁰⁷

The improved defense relations between Singapore and China, while significant, should not threaten U.S.-Singapore defense relations. As previously noted, Singapore relies heavily on U.S. support on both levels of its defense plan. The lack of a domestic outcry against a robust defense relationship with the United States further bolsters the current arrangement. According to a RAND interview with Evelyn Goh,

Singapore is probably the only country in ASEAN that can have as close a military relationship with the United States as it does without domestic political problems. While China may be displeased with the high level of Singaporean defense cooperation with the United States, the Chinese have relatively few levers to use on Singapore in this regard.¹⁰⁸

Consequently, Singapore has and will most likely continue to covet U.S. military assistance and presence in East Asia.

5. U.S.-Thai Security Relations

Thailand has an active security relationship with the United States and has long collaborated with the United States on security matters. Thailand supported U.S. military efforts in the Korean, Vietnam, Persian Gulf, OEF and OIF conflicts. For these contributions, the United States has reciprocated by affording Thailand opportunities to acquire U.S. military hardware and training. The U.S. and Thai militaries appear to maintain a close relationship through active collaboration. Despite this appearance

¹⁰⁶ Singapore Ministry of Defense, "Singapore and China Agree to Enhance Bilateral Defense Exchanges," (November 16, 2005).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Evelyn Goh, interview by RAND Corporation, December 2005.

however, the Thai military also maintains affable relations with the PLA. Although not as involved as the one with the U.S. military, this relationship is still extensive enough to warrant attention.

Recent examples of Thai support for U.S. military operations are abundant. The Thai government authorized the U.S. military to use the U-Tapao naval airbase and Sattahib naval base for logistical support during the launch of Operation Enduring Freedom. After the fall of Kabul, Bangkok dispatched 130 engineers, medics, and Special Forces troops to Afghanistan to aid reconstruction. Thailand also sent 450 engineers and medics to Iraq to help with road building and medical care.¹⁰⁹ Thai forces have also cooperated closely in the Asian component of the global war on terrorism. A notable example of such support was the arrest of Jamaah Islamiah leader (an al Qaeda affiliate), Hambali, and the capture of several other top leaders who were suspected of plotting attacks against U.S. interests.¹¹⁰

The U.S.-Thai military relationship is even strong enough to endure turbulent times. During the period of temporary suspension of military cooperation after the 2006 coup, U.S. and Thai forces worked to maintain the preexisting channels of communication and uphold vital links in the traditionally cooperative relationship. For example, both sides worked to ensure that events such as the annual Cobra Gold exercises still took place. Military relations quickly returned to normal in 2008 after the newly elected government took office.¹¹¹

In response to Bangkok's support in security issues, the United States has for years afforded Thailand much defense related support. In October 2003, the United States declared Thailand a major non-NATO U.S. ally, which enabled Bangkok to purchase new types of U.S. military hardware along with improved access to credit guarantees.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 152.

¹¹⁰ For more on U.S.-Thai military relationships, see Chanlet-Avery, *Thailand: Background and U.S. Relations* (Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2005).

¹¹¹ Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise*, 153.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 152.

In addition to arms transfers, examples of support include offering military training to Thai forces in the United States and conducting numerous joint training exercises each year. The Cobra Gold exercise, held annually in Thailand, is actually the biggest U.S. annual joint exercise in Asia.¹¹³ The collective experiences gained through defense collaboration have greatly helped solidify U.S.-Thai military relations.

Parallel to Bangkok's effort to nurture military relations with the United States, the Thai leadership has also been actively engaging the PRC on defense related issues. Although not as long as the relationship with the U.S. military, Thailand's military relationship with China has been well-established and dates back to 1979, when the two cooperated against Soviet-backed Vietnamese forces.¹¹⁴ Most of this cooperation came via arms transfers, which even today is still the primary venue for military diplomacy between the PRC and Thailand. Weapons have ranged from tanks to artillery and naval warships.¹¹⁵ In 2002, Bangkok ordered two 1,400-ton (fully loaded) offshore patrol vessels that have since been delivered.¹¹⁶ China has also finished field-testing a tank specifically for the Thai market. Finally, the two nations agreed on the sale of ninety-seven armored personnel carriers in 2005.¹¹⁷

Further improving Sino-Thai military relations beyond arms trade encounters, Senior Thai and Chinese military officials have long enjoyed frequent contacts. Thailand and China initiated annual ministerial level defense security consultations in 2002.¹¹⁸ The Thai Navy and the PLA Navy held their first joint exercise in December 2005. And China proposed a joint maritime regional exercise with Thailand and other states during an

¹¹³ Chanlet-Avery, *Thailand: Background and U.S. Relations* (Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2005), 8.

¹¹⁴ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 150.

¹¹⁵ "China Goes All Out to Woo Southeast Asia," *The Korea Herald* (Seoul, August 6, 2001).

¹¹⁶ Jane's, "Corvettes, Thailand," *Jane's Fighting Ships* (December 6, 2007).

¹¹⁷ Yihong Chang and Robert Karniol, "China Tempts Thailand with Modified MBT," *Jane's Defense Weekly* (February 15, 2006).

¹¹⁸ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2004*, December 2004, <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20041227/index.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008).

ASEAN foreign ministers meeting in 2005.¹¹⁹ Army Commander-in-Chief Sonthi Boonvaratglin visited Beijing in 2006 and received a \$49 million package of military aid and training.¹²⁰ Thailand dispatched thirty Special Forces soldiers, including a lieutenant general, to Guangzhou in July 2007, for two-week combined exercises.¹²¹

Unlike other U.S. strategic partners, Thailand's defense policy does not display definitive signs of allegiance to the United States. Bangkok appears to maintain strong military relations with the United States and China alike. This can perhaps be attributed to the belief among Thai elites that "the nation's position and history provide a powerful guide, one that finds security in omnidirectional diplomacy and, in particular, remaining on good terms with major powers."¹²² Bearing this in mind, the U.S. military must consistently stay engaged with the Thai armed forces through active relations. Even minor set backs such as slowing relations during periods of regime instability (military coups) may afford the PLA an edge in what can potentially materialize into a vigorous competition for the esteem of the Thai armed forces.

6. China's Strategic Partners

Just as the U.S. displayed tendencies to nurture defense relations with certain strategic partners, China had its favorites as well. Pakistan and Russia consistently ranked as China's top two partners in maintaining defense-focused ties. In addition to these two countries, China also had significantly higher levels of defense interaction with Burma and North Korea than the United States. This section assesses the context of Beijing's security relationships with these four countries and suggests that besides Pakistan, the U.S. military has noticeably less influence over these countries through military diplomacy activities.

¹¹⁹ Evan S. Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008), 151.

¹²⁰ "Post-Coup Thailand in the Eyes of the U.S. and China," *The Nation* (Bangkok, February 12, 2007).

¹²¹ Lin Li, "China, Thailand Stage Combined Training of Special Troops," *Gov.cn*, July 16, 2007, http://www.gov.cn/misc/2007-07/16/content_686577.htm (accessed January 23, 2009).

¹²² Medeiros et al., *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise*, 155.

7. China-Pakistan Security Relations

China has long maintained close defense ties to Pakistan. Historically, China has used its relationship with Pakistan to keep India, its main rival in South Asia, tied down.¹²³ Dr. Swaran Singh, an Associate Professor at the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University in New Delhi and Academic Consultant at Center de Sciences Humaines, also in New Delhi, refers to the China-Pakistan relationship as an “all-weather, time-tested, long-standing special relationship.”¹²⁴

In addition to routine high-level visits, China has maintained this special relationship through a multi-faceted approach, which included supplying conventional weapons, providing defense technologies and conducting joint military exercises. Supplying weapons to Pakistan remains a staple of Beijing’s defense relationship with Pakistan. China is consistently Pakistan’s most reliable supplier of weapons. As reported by the *SIPRI Yearbook 2005*, Pakistan ordered four Jiangwei-class Frigates, 4 Z-9C ASW helicopters, two Type-347G Fire Control Radars and sixteen C-802 Anti-ship missiles from China between 2002 and 2005 alone.¹²⁵ In addition to the transfer of weapons, it has been highly speculated that China might be passing “nuclear and missile technologies and know-how to and from Pakistan.”¹²⁶ Finally, of the eleven joint exercises the PLA conducted from 2001 to 2006, four were bilateral exercises with Pakistan.

Although Pakistan has long had a “special relationship” with China, the GWOT refocused military relations with the United States dramatically. Under President George W. Bush’s administration, Pakistan became one of the leading recipients of U.S. aid. This includes having received about \$2.2 billion in security-related aid since 2001. Moreover,

¹²³ J. Mohan Malik, “China-India Relations in the Post-Soviet Era: The Continuing Rivalry,” *The China Quarterly* (London), June 1995, 324.

¹²⁴ Swaran Singh, “China-South Asia: Changing Contours,” *Occasional Paper for National Defense University’s annual Pacific Symposium on China’s Global Activism* (Fort McNair: National Defense University, June 20, 2006), 4.

¹²⁵ Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *SIPRI Yearbook 2005: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 460, 467, 509.

¹²⁶ Swaran Singh, “China-South Asia: Changing Contours,” *Occasional Paper for National Defense University’s annual Pacific Symposium on China’s Global Activism* (Fort McNair: National Defense University, June 20, 2006), 4.

Pakistan has also received some \$6 billion in military reimbursements for supporting U.S.-led counterterrorism efforts.¹²⁷ Additionally, in 2006, the United States signed arms transfer agreements with Pakistan in excess of \$3.5 billion, which ranked Pakistan first among all arms clients in that year.¹²⁸ According to the Bush administration, these sales were a part of the effort to shore up relations with a “vital ally of the United States” in fighting the GWOT. U.S. military and intelligence officials have also deliberately applauded military-to-military relations with Pakistan. In November 2007, Lt. Gen. Carter Ham called Pakistan “a great partner so far in the war on terror” and lauded collaboration and cooperation in border missions.¹²⁹ In another instance, Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff, reiterated Washington's commitment to Pakistan during a visit to Islamabad in June 2008. In his words, “Pakistan and the United States remain steadfast allies, and Pakistan’s military is fighting bravely against terrorism.”¹³⁰

The defense relationships between China, Pakistan and the United States may be evolving. Traditionally, Pakistan has been a strategic ally of the PRC and the United States has had close defense ties with India. However, under the influence of the GWOT, the United States has made new efforts to improve relations with Pakistan via enhanced defense relations. This improvement can become a potential lever to challenge the status quo defined by the last few decades.

8. China-Russia Security Relations

The security relationship between Beijing and Moscow has experienced drastically different climates since the founding of the PRC. The spectrum of this

¹²⁷ K. Alan Kronstadt, *Pakistan-U.S. Relations* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2008), 2.

¹²⁸ Richard F. Grimmett, *U.S. Arms Sales to Pakistan* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2007), 1.

¹²⁹ Lt. Gen. Carter Ham, *U.S. Department of Defense Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) News Transcripts*, November 7, 2007, <http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=4084> (accessed January 24, 2009).

¹³⁰ Jim Garamone, “Mullen Says Meetings in Pakistan Strengthen Military Relationships,” *American Forces Press Service New Articles*, June 5, 2008, <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=50108>. (accessed January 24, 2009).

relationship has varied from being comrades in arms to bitter enemies. Today, the defense relationship between China and Russia appears to be waxing. This trend appears to have been driven by the West's arms embargo against China, Russia's dire economic situation after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and Russia's unfavorable views of the United States.

While Russian weapon transfers to China may be slowing, the amount of arms transferred has been high in recent years. With the Western arms sales to China embargo in place since 1989, Russia has been China's primary supply of modern weapons. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's 2008 handbook, Russia was responsible for making 25 percent of the world's conventional weapons transfers from 2003 to 2007. Of these transfers, 45 percent were exclusively to China.¹³¹ Since neither Russia nor China discloses comprehensive figures on weapons shipments, the exact dollar amount of transfers remain elusive. However, according to some estimates based announced deals, press reports and private monitoring of arms transfers, deliveries to China from 1992 to 2006 totaled \$26 billion.¹³²

The defense relationship between Russia and China has been mutually beneficial for the two countries. China has received much-needed technology and weapons to help modernize the PLA. Russia has received a generous income to help sustain its sizeable defense industry after the collapse of the Soviet Union. While some experts cite Russia's concerns for an emerging China threat as the PLA continues to gain strength and question the future of the defense relationship between the two countries, there is certainly still reason for the relationship to continue.

Although a stronger China may become potential threat to Russia's own security, Moscow may also see a stronger China as a means of challenging U.S. military dominance. During a speech at the 2007 Munich Conference on Security Policy, Vladimir Putin strongly condemned U.S. military force. In his words,

¹³¹ SIPRI, *SIPRI 2008 Yearbook*, December 2008, <http://yearbook2008.sipri.org/files/SIPRIYB08summary.pdf> (accessed January 29, 2009).

¹³² David Lague, *Russia and China Rethink Arms Deals*, March 2, 2008, <http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/03/02/asia/arms.php?page=1> (accessed January 29, 2009).

Today we are witnessing an almost uncontained hyper use of force—military force—in international relations, force that is plunging the world into an abyss of permanent conflicts...We are seeing a greater and greater disdain for the basic principles of international law. And independent legal norms are, as a matter of fact, coming increasingly closer to one state's legal system. One state, and, of course, first and foremost the United States, has overstepped its national bounds in every way.¹³³

From this perspective, Russia may accept some potential risks associated with modernizing the PLA and continue to maintain a tight defense relationship with China in the future because it sees the U.S. military global dominance as a bigger threat.

While the political climate may constrain military-to-military relations between the United States and Russia, there is certainly room for improvement in the level of interactions between the two militaries. From 2005 to 2007, the level of U.S.-Russian military interaction was roughly on par with the U.S. military's interactions with Nepal.¹³⁴ Given the size and geopolitical importance differential between Russia and Nepal, there is obvious disparity in the level of effort the U.S. military exerted in engaging Russian counterparts. Consequently, from the military-to-military relations perspective, the PLA possessed an edge over the U.S. military in conducting diplomacy with Russia.

9. China-Burma Security Relations

Burma presents a unique situation for military diplomacy. The Burmese military established rule through a military junta in 1988. This government became known as the State Peace and Development Council or SPDC. The SPDC has since been affiliated with problems such as human rights abuses and corruption, which instigated extensive U.S. sanctions against the SPDC. U.S. interaction with Burma has, in recent years, been virtually non-existent and the probability for developing military relations with the ruling

¹³³ Vladimir Putin, *Speech at the 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy*, February 10, 2007, <http://www.securityconference.de/konferenzen/rede.php?sprache=en&id=179> (accessed January 29, 2009).

¹³⁴ According to PACOM records for 2005-2007, the U.S. military took part in 37 conferences, 12 miscellaneous military-to-military events, 2 high-level visits, 19 exercise/training events, and 61 PME/education exchanges with Nepal. There were 40 conferences, 11 miscellaneous military-to-military events, 2 high-level visits, 13 exercise/training events, and 11 PME/education exchanges with Russia in the same period.

junta seems unlikely if not impossible in the foreseeable future. In contrast to U.S. actions, the PRC continues to be one of Burma's main supporters. The two countries maintain a close mutually beneficial relationship, with defense ties as an important pillar of the relationship. The situation framed by the lack of U.S. contacts and China's active relations with Burma implies that even though Washington has no direct contact with Burma, there could be potential to exert influence on the SPDC through a collaborative relationship with Beijing.

The SPDC's corruption problems inhibit U.S. abilities to maintain security relations with Burma. According to Transparency International's 2007 *Corruption Perceptions Index*, Burma was tied with Somalia as the most corrupt country in the world. This is a further deterioration from its 2006 position as the second-most corrupt country in the world.¹³⁵ Corruption in Burma is so pervasive that even the Burmese armed forces, or *Tatmadaw*, are suspected of being directly involved in opium poppy cultivation, trafficking and distribution.¹³⁶ Washington has intentionally isolated the SPDC because it does not want to convey an approving or legitimizing gesture unintentionally toward the SPDC.

The PRC has not embraced comparable standards of conduct in dealing with Burma. As affirmed by Michael Green and Derek Mitchell in "Asia's Forgotten Crisis: A New Approach to Burma," Beijing's interactions with Burma have been essential to the SPDC's survival.¹³⁷ In addition to economic aid, China has provided Burma with an estimated \$2 to \$3 billion in military aid since the early 1990s, which has enabled the Burmese army to expand from 180,000 to 450,000 in 2005. China was also active in shipping weapons to Burma in 2006, coinciding with the Burmese army's offensive against the Karens.¹³⁸ The actions of Beijing has provided the SPDC with both "moral

¹³⁵ Transparency International, "Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2006," (2006).

¹³⁶ Michael Black and Anthony Davis, "War and Peace: The UWSA and Tensions in Myanmar," *Jane's Intelligence Review*, March 2008.

¹³⁷ Michael Green and Derek Mitchell, "Asia's Forgotten Crisis: A New Approach to Burma," *Foreign Affairs*, November/December 2007, 149.

¹³⁸ Larry A. Niksch, *U.S.-Burma Relations* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2007), 11.

and financial support—including funds and materiel to pay off Burmese military elites — thus increasing its leverage at home and abroad.”¹³⁹ Furthermore, the authors argue that “By throwing China's weight behind the SPDC, Beijing has complicated the strategic calculations of those of Burma's neighbors that are concerned about the direction the country is moving in, thus enabling the junta to pursue a classic divide-and-conquer approach.”¹⁴⁰

In exchange for supporting the SPDC and taking the position that political and human rights conditions in Burma are its “internal affairs,” China receives important military benefits in return. For example, China has access to ports and listening posts in Burma, which allow the PLA to monitor naval and other military activities around the Indian Ocean and the Andaman Sea. Moreover, Beijing receives preferential deals for access to Burma's oil and gas reserves to feed its insatiable appetite for energy.¹⁴¹

As China continues to provide support for the SPDC, the current Burmese regime is unlikely to alter its course. The Sino-Burmese relationship simply offers too many benefits for the two parties involved to deviate from the present status quo. As this relationship continues, the United States, if it remains on the course of its current policies, will continue to forfeit the ability to directly shape Burma.

10. China-North Korea Security Relations

North Korea is perhaps the most difficult partner with which China maintains security relations. As Daniel Sneider, the associate director for research at Stanford's Asia-Pacific Research Center points out, “Everyone who deals with North Korea recognizes them as a very unstable actor.”¹⁴² Even in the face of such difficulties, China remains North Korea's closest ally. For Beijing, maintaining active security ties with Pyongyang enhances the state-to-state relationship, which serves China's national

¹³⁹ Michael Green and Derek Mitchell, “Asia's Forgotten Crisis: A New Approach to Burma,” *Foreign Affairs*, November/December 2007, 149.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 147.

¹⁴² Jayshree Bajoria, *The China-North Korea Relationship*, June 18, 2008, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/11097/> (accessed January 31, 2009).

objectives. Currently, the biggest threat to China's defense ties to North Korea stem from Pyongyang's actions (e.g., the unannounced 2006 missile tests). Washington has virtually no defense relations with Pyongyang and therefore is not in a position to compete with Beijing over maintaining security ties with North Korea.

Pyongyang is not a reliable ally for Beijing because Kim Jong-Il's foreign policy is, like its leader, highly unpredictable. In Sneider's words, North Korea is "extremely difficult to deal with, even as an ally." Furthermore, he says the relationship between Beijing and Pyongyang is by no means "a warm and fuzzy relationship."¹⁴³ For this reason, Daniel Pinkston, a Northeast Asia expert at the International Crisis Group, agrees that despite a long alliance, Beijing does not control Pyongyang. In Pinkston's view, "In general, Americans tend to overestimate the influence China has over North Korea." He argues that Kim still makes up his own mind: "At the end of the day, China has little influence over the military decisions."¹⁴⁴ Even so, "Beijing, arguably, continues to have more leverage over Pyongyang than any other nation and has played a central role in the ongoing Six-Party Talks, the multilateral framework aimed at denuclearizing North Korea."¹⁴⁵

Beijing nurtures its leverage on Pyongyang in the interest of supporting its own objectives. Maintaining a friendly North Korea has strategic value; such a relationship "ensures a friendly nation on its northeastern border, as well as providing a buffer zone between China and democratic South Korea, which is home to around 29,000 U.S. troops and marines."¹⁴⁶ According to Shen Dingli of the Institute of International Studies at Fudan University in Shanghai, this allows China to reduce its military deployment in its Northeast and "focus more directly on the issue of Taiwanese independence."¹⁴⁷

¹⁴³ Jayshree Bajoria, *The China-North Korea Relationship*, June 18, 2008, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/11097/> (accessed January 31, 2009).

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Jayshree Bajoria, *The China-North Korea Relationship*.

¹⁴⁷ Shen Dingli, "North Korea's Strategic Significance to China," *China Security* (Autumn 2006): 19-34.

China's recent efforts in maintaining security relations with North Korea through military diplomacy are evident. Since 2000, China has hosted four visits from Kim Jong Il and both Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao have visited Pyongyang.¹⁴⁸ Moreover, in December 2008, Liang Guanglie, Chief of the PLA General Staff, met with Yon Kyong Chol, deputy director general of Military Foreign Affairs Division of the Ministry of People's Armed Forces of DPRK.¹⁴⁹ As China analyst Ken Allen notes, these increases in military relations between the two states "underscore the length and depth" of bilateral relations between China and North Korea.¹⁵⁰

In contrast to China's security relationship with North Korea, the United States has had virtually no defense-centric contacts with North Korea. The only instances of direct engagements revolve around the recovery efforts of U.S. soldier remains from the Korean War and discussions of Pyongyang's nuclear activities. Outside of direct interaction, U.S. leadership continues to condemn North Korea's arms sales publicly to and technology cooperation with countries like Iran and Syria, as well as North Korean involvement in international terrorism.¹⁵¹ While Washington's direct interactions with Pyongyang through the Six-Party Talks has potentially yielded significant results, indirect engagements have done little in altering the course of North Korean behavior.

North Korea has been and mostly likely will continue to be a conundrum as a security partner. Of Pyongyang's existing security ties, the PRC holds the strongest leverage and hence the most influence. U.S. defense ties to North Korea are weak at best and offer little chance in the immediate future of becoming a substantial conduit for influence from Washington.

¹⁴⁸ "Traditional China-DPRK Friendship Gains New Momentum," *PLA Daily*, June 18, 2008, http://english.pladaily.com.cn/site2/news-channels/2008-06/18/content_1320570.htm (accessed January 30, 2009).

¹⁴⁹ "Chinese Defense Minister Meets DPRK Guest," *PLA Daily*, December 13, 2008, http://english.pladaily.com.cn/site2/news-channels/2008-12/13/content_1582899.htm (accessed January 30, 2009).

¹⁵⁰ Kenneth Allen, *PLA Air Force Foreign Relations* (CNA Corporation, 2007), 5.

¹⁵¹ Larry A. Niksch, *Korea-U.S. Relations: Issues for Congress* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2008).

11. Summary

This section examined the political contexts surrounding each security relationship the U.S. and Chinese militaries maintained with their respective strategic partners. In each relationship, inherent interests connected the parties involved. A closer examination of these connections revealed that current relationships appear stable and hence unlikely to be altered easily. Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Singapore will most likely remain strategic partners to the United States in the near term. Similarly, Russian, Burma and North Korea will, in all probability, continue the same theme of association with China. The future conduct of Thailand and Pakistan appear to be less predictable. The nature of these existing defense relationships suggest that some countries may be more easily persuaded than others in altering the current dominant features of Asia's defense relationship landscape.

C. PREFERRED TOOLS

As Chapter I elaborated, the U.S. approach to conducting military diplomacy was fairly well balanced in that that tools from each of the four categories of engagement: strategic-level activities, regional activities, PME exchanges, and non-traditional security cooperation were all employed on a regular basis. The U.S. military especially emphasized high-level visits, PME exchanges, bi-lateral/multi-lateral conferences, and joint exercises and training events. China, on the other hand, demonstrated a more limited approach by predominantly enhancing security relationships through regional activities such as regional forums and through high-level official visits or exchanges. Even though China's military diplomacy efforts appeared more limited overall, there were four specific areas where the PRC was on equal footing or even possessed an advantage over the United States. These areas were consultations and strategic dialogues; state-to-state military protocols; regional forum participation; and peacekeeping operations.

The purpose of this section is to examine each of the four above-mentioned areas more closely by evaluating the U.S. military's responses. The goal is to assess whether the PLA's current equal footing or advantage in these areas will potentially challenge or adversely affect the future of U.S. military diplomacy efforts in Asia. This section will

offer that disregarding the possible differences in value of each activity type, the U.S. military's overall diplomacy effort in Asia is likely to remain more successful than comparable efforts exerted by Chinese counterparts.

1. Consultations and Strategic Dialogues

Holding defense consultations and strategic dialogues with Asian countries is a military diplomacy venue that the PLA employed as effectively as the U.S. military. China took a very comprehensive approach in engaging other Asian countries through consultations. As the last chapter noted, even though the occurrences with each country remain low, China held defense consultations with Indonesia, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Russia and Vietnam within the period of 2003 to 2006.¹⁵² The U.S. military engaged almost all Asian countries through high numbers of bilateral/multi-lateral conferences. North Korea was the only country that the U.S. military did not actively participate in defense consultations or strategic dialogues with.¹⁵³

On the surface, the U.S. military's high volume engagements across almost all Asian countries would seem to hold the advantage, but on closer consideration, the net impact achieved would rank the two militaries equally effective in this area. Even though the U.S. military had more interactions with more partners, the engagements occurred via conferences at working levels. The PLA, on the other hand, conducted fewer engagements, but kept most interactions on more strategic (i.e., Defense Ministerial or General Staff) levels.¹⁵⁴ Assuming strategic level engagements hold more prospective impact for "Consultations and Strategic Dialogues," the PLA balanced U.S. volume with strategic significance.

¹⁵² People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2004*, December 2004, <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20041227/index.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008); People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, *China's National Defense in 2006*, December 29, 2006, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/wp2006.html#2> (accessed August 17, 2008).

¹⁵³ The Six-Party Talks were not accounted for under this category because the talks were brokered by China.

¹⁵⁴ Observed from event descriptions in PACOM's TSCIMS and China's Defense White Papers.

Assuming the PLA will maintain its current mode of operation in conducting consultations and strategic dialogues, the U.S. military would have to increase the impact of its interactions in order to gain the advantage in this military diplomacy venue. Since the volume of activities with almost all Asian countries is already high, the most prominent remedy would be to elevate the level on which engagements occur.

2. State-to-State Military Protocols

Conducting state-to-state military protocols is another venue where PLA efforts were comparable to that of the U.S. military's. Each military had its strength but also its associated weakness. The combination of qualities resulted in similar effects.

The PLA was more successful in engaging a higher number of Asian countries through state-to-state military protocols but fell short in consistency. Holding frequent military protocols with almost all Asian countries afforded the PLA opportunities to maintain military relations with all Asian countries except Bhutan and Taiwan. The shortcoming in the process was the lack of predictability in patterns of reoccurrence. China's protocol pattern was more sporadic than repetitious.

The U.S. military's efforts in using the same diplomacy tool were also strong and demonstrated more consistency, but engaged fewer Asian countries than the PLA. The U.S. military did not engage Bhutan, Burma, Laos, North Korea, Russia, or Timor-Leste through holding state-to-state military protocols. The U.S. military was, however, more consistent in maintaining recurring visits with countries. Most visits occurred on a predictable yearly basis. With consistency already in place, expanding the number of Asian countries engaged would enhance the U.S. military's ability, over the PLA, to nourish military relations through this tool.

3. Regional Forums

Beijing possessed a distinct advantage over Washington in reinforcing security relationships through regional forums. The United States, not being native to Asia, tends to have less of a legitimate stake in its regional forums. For the most part, China has a large stake in important Asian regional forums such as the SCO, and for good reason. As

stated in a RAND report dealing with U.S. interests in Central Asia, “China, the neighborhood’s other heavy hitter, is also anxious to enhance its relationships with the Central Asian republics; it is the lead nation in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and has participated in multiple military exercises with various Central Asian countries.”¹⁵⁵ Even though such an environment favors the PLA’s ability to exert influence through regional forums, there is not cause for immediate alarm. The U.S. military exerts influence in the same areas via other means.

Chapter I discussed the various forums that the PRC is involved in. Of the numerous forums discussed, the SCO and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) are the most defense-centric mediums the PLA directly operates within. These forums have served as mediums for the PLA to shore up relations with other militaries by allowing PLA participation in defense-related activities ranging from conferences to military exercises.

With regard to the PLA’s participation in the SCO and ARF, combating terrorism has often been an underlying theme. Since 2001, fighting terrorism has become a mainstream military interest. Consequently, security cooperation on the issue has been on the rise as well. While China has used counterterrorism cooperation to maneuver the PLA into better position to conduct military diplomacy with SCO and ARF members, the United States has also used the same issue to build ties with members of these two forums. The U.S. military improved ties with the Central Asian SCO members through the effort to support OEF, and at the same time, reinforced relationships with ARF members such as the Philippines, Thailand and Indonesia.

Activities revolving around OEF deeply entrenched the U.S. military in Central Asia. As a RAND report succinctly states, “The onset of U.S. military operations against the Taliban regime and its al Qaeda allies dramatically heightened the nature and extent of U.S. military engagement with the former Soviet republics of Central Asia.”¹⁵⁶ U.S.

¹⁵⁵ RAND Corporation, “Defining U.S. Interests in Central Asia,” 2005, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG338.pdf (accessed December 11, 2008), 41.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 39.

engagement in the region not only included setting up military bases (Karshi-Khanabad, Uzbekistan, and Manas, Kyrgyzstan), but also provided generous military aid and training for various countries.¹⁵⁷

Washington reinforced the security relationship with Uzbekistan through various forms of military assistance. This assistance has included two armored cutters (for patrolling the Amu Darya River), radios, helicopter upgrades, language training, non-commissioned officer (NCO) training support, a military modeling and simulation center, psychological operations training, airport navigation system upgrades, and, according to some reports, joint construction with the United States of Il-114 aircraft.¹⁵⁸ Furthermore, the Uzbeks have benefited from participating in joint military exercises with the U.S. military, to include informal ones undertaken by U.S. troops and Uzbek Air Force personnel at the Khanabad air base.¹⁵⁹

Washington also presented Kyrgyzstan with assorted military aid. Kyrgyzstan received military equipment including communications equipment (estimated at over \$1.4 million in value), night vision capability, and reportedly, helicopters. Moreover, Kyrgyzstan also received military medical assistance, Marshall Center slots, and NCO training.¹⁶⁰ In addition, Military-to-military contacts, including high-level visits, were also increased. Even the U.S. Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, visited in November 2002.¹⁶¹ Joint exercises and training involving Special Forces, peacekeepers, and rapid reaction troops also increased. The U.S. military even promised to help with military reform.¹⁶² Furthermore, relations received another boost at the end of 2005 when the U.S. military shifted most of its OEF support air operations from Karshi-Khanabad to

¹⁵⁷ Although the United States discontinued using Karshi-Khanabad to support operations in Afghanistan in November 2005, much aid was supplied to the Uzbekistan.

¹⁵⁸ RAND Corporation, "Defining U.S. Interests in Central Asia," 2005, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG338.pdf (accessed December 11, 2008), 13.

¹⁵⁹ U.S. Military Personnel, interview by RAND Corporation, May 2003.

¹⁶⁰ RAND Corporation, "Defining U.S. Interests in Central Asia," 13.

¹⁶¹ *RFE/RL Newsline*, "Kyrgyzstan, U. S. Sign Military Cooperation Agreement," November 13, 2002.

¹⁶² Vladimir Socor, "Cheek by Jowl in Kyrgyzstan," *Wall Street Journal*, August 8, 2003.

Manas. In June of 2008, the outgoing U.S. commander at Manas reportedly revealed that the United States paid \$17.5 million to lease the land for U.S. facilities and \$21 million for airport fees each year.¹⁶³

In addition to receiving direct U.S. military aid, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan have also benefited from the U.S.-led military presence within its borders. U.S. (and other coalition) forces have paid for extensive infrastructure upgrades in both Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan. The upgrades ranged from the construction of new housing and other structures to improving runways. There are other monetary benefits as well. For example, Kyrgyzstan received payment for each aircraft takeoff and landing at Manas Airfield.¹⁶⁴

Even though Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan are the two Central Asian countries that received the most substantial amount of military aid, Tajikistan also received considerable assistance to its military. Beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2002, the United States started assisting the Tajikistan military through FMF and IMET funds. These funds helped reform the Tajik military and improved its capabilities in conducting counterinsurgency and counternarcotics operations. In addition, the funds helped to facilitate better interoperability with other forces, including those of the United States, by providing medical equipment, demining equipment, night vision devices, English language training, and exposure of military and civilian officials to Western-style democracy, civil-military relations, and human rights policies.¹⁶⁵

The United States also improved relations with Turkmenistan through military relations as well, albeit on a very limited level. The Turkmen displayed willingness to cooperate on humanitarian efforts by allowing U.S. refueling operations to be based within its borders but did not show interest in accepting aid.¹⁶⁶ An agreement was

¹⁶³ Jim Nichol, *Central Asia: Regional Developments and Implications for U.S. Interests* (Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2008), 29.

¹⁶⁴ RAND Corporation, "Defining U.S. Interests in Central Asia," 2005, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG338.pdf (accessed December 11, 2008), 13.

¹⁶⁵ RAND Corporation, "Defining U.S. Interests in Central Asia," 14-15.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 29.

reached with the Turkmen government that refueling missions were allowed as long as they were humanitarian and not combat in nature.¹⁶⁷ In this respect, although limited, cooperation has improved under the premise of NTSC.

In conjunction with U.S. efforts to build better military relations with the SCO members, the U.S. armed forces also improved ties with select ARF members. As discussed earlier, three ARF members, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, were among the top five of the U.S. military's most active engagement partners. In addition, the United States maintains robust relationships with all other members, with the exception of Burma.

So while China's ties through regional forums have given the PLA new opportunities to enhance military ties with select Asian countries, the underpinning issues that sustain these military relationships also supported U.S. military interaction with many of the same countries. From this perspective, the advantage that the PLA possessed through China's close relations with Asia's regional forums have had no significant effects on U.S. military relations with countries who have memberships in the same regional forums. The U.S. military simply needs to continue the current course and capitalize on existing opportunities.

4. Peacekeeping

Beijing vigorously advertises the involvement of its forces in peacekeeping operations. The 2004 and 2006 defense White Papers publicized China's peacekeeping involvement in Asia by drawing attention to the 899 troops dispatched to Cambodia and Timor-Leste. The U.S. military was not involved in any peacekeeping activities in Asia during the same period. Hence, China may have an edge in this facet of military diplomacy. In spite of this, there are two things to consider. First, the compositions of Chinese forces involved were not always military. Second, outside of peacekeeping, China's participation in the full spectrum of NTSC activities was limited.

¹⁶⁷ U.S. Officials, interview by RAND Corporation, Summer 2003.

In accomplishing peacekeeping missions, Beijing often dispatches forces composed of non-military members. These members often include medical personnel, engineers or police. The makeup of these forces draws questions about making appropriate “military diplomacy” comparisons. The United States may very well have humanitarian aid works in the same countries that are not accounted for in the same way.

The next point is that peacekeeping is only one of the three activities falling under the umbrella of non-traditional security cooperation. The other two activities are counter-terrorism and humanitarian assistance. From this perspective, the U.S. military is still distinctively more capable of building military relations through comprehensive NTSC activities. China’s comparatively small volume of counterterrorism activities indicates that the PLA’s capabilities in this realm are still limited. Furthermore, the PLA’s humanitarian assistance capabilities remain somewhat inept, as was demonstrated by its inefficient execution of relief efforts after the recent Sichuan earthquake. As noted in a *Joint Forces Quarterly* article, the shortcomings were caused by poorly integrated command structure, aging equipment, and personnel not trained to deal with large scale humanitarian and disaster relief contingencies.¹⁶⁸

5. Summary

The purpose of this “Preferred Tools” section was to examine more closely each of the four tools the PLA employed as well or better than the U.S. military in conducting diplomacy. After evaluating PLA actions in the four categories discussed earlier against the backdrop of corresponding U.S. activities in other venues of military diplomacy, there appears to be no immediate challenge or threat to the U.S. ability to consolidate relationships through defense-centric activities in Asia. From that perspective, the U.S. armed forces remain dominant over the PLA in conducting diplomacy in the region.

Despite the current success, however, there are available measures to enhance U.S. military diplomacy effectiveness further. In conducting consultations and strategic dialogues, the U.S. military can yield more impact by elevating the level at which

¹⁶⁸ Nirav Patel, “Chinese Disaster Relief Operations: Identifying Critical Capability Gaps,” *Joint Forces Quarterly* (1st quarter 2009): 111-117.

interactions take place. In the realm of state-to-state military protocols, there is room to expand the list of engagement partners. Additionally, although U.S. military diplomacy is not directly threatened by the PLA's participation in regional forums and peacekeeping operations in Asia, increased U.S. military participation in these capacities could further enhance the United States' overall military diplomacy effort.

D. THE CAVEAT TO MEASURING SUCCESS

Some important considerations must be made in declaring the U.S. military victorious over the PLA in conducting diplomacy. The research effort of this project did not assign any weighted values to the different activity types of military diplomacy: possible differentials in the amount of impact different activities may possess were neglected.

The effect of impact is obviously very important to measure whose military diplomacy effort in Asia is making the bigger difference in solidifying security relationships. Obtaining the answer to this question would, however, be extremely challenging. The process would have to involve listing all venues of military diplomacy with each country and then assigning weighted values to each venue for the degree of importance (based on either perception, results, or some combination of both). All venues multiplied by the predetermined weighted value would then yield a value reflecting the impact of that particular venue. Finally, the impacts of each venue would be summarized to gain a total value reflecting the effectiveness of military diplomacy for that specific country. The equation below demonstrates this point:

$$Ax + By + Cz = \text{Net worth of military diplomacy effort with country X}$$

In the above equation, A, B and C would be venues of military diplomacy such as the number of high-level visits, FMS, and joint exercises. These venues would be multiplied by x, y, and z, which are predetermined weighted values that most accurately reflect how country X prioritizes the importance of different types of military engagements. For example, if country Burma sees high-level visits as affirmation for the legitimacy of its regime, a higher weighted value would be placed on venue A.

This process would mostly likely become difficult and complex. First, the research project would have to accurately estimate the level of importance each country associates with different military diplomacy venues. Second, all military-to-military interactions have to be accounted for accurately. Next, a military diplomacy impact value would have to be figured for each Asian country. Finally, the values for all Asian countries have to be summarized to arrive at a value reflecting total military diplomacy efforts in Asia.

The complexity and scope of such an undertaking would be beyond the grasp and capabilities of this project. Consequently, this author did not attempt to attach weighted values to any military diplomacy activities. This project only compared how the United States and China each conducted military diplomacy with all countries in Asia. The comparison found U.S. efforts to be effective. However, these results could change if weighted values were implemented to the comparative process.

E. SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to analyze these three observations, provide potential explanations, and assess future impacts to U.S. military diplomacy efforts in Asia. The first section suggested that the overall military diplomacy activity level disparity between the U.S. and Chinese militaries is attributed to disproportions in military capabilities between the two forces. While the PLA is increasingly gaining credibility and progressing towards becoming a modern military force, its power projection capabilities remain limited. This limitation is what constrained the PLA's ability to engage in higher levels of activities across all military diplomacy activities. The United States, on the other hand, is supported by a military commensurate with that of a superpower. The U.S. military readily exercised the capabilities of a superpower military in interacting with the militaries of almost all Asian nations. During these interactions, the volumes of activities were high and occurred across a wide array of military diplomacy tools.

The second section analyzed the relationships the U.S. and Chinese militaries maintained with what this project referred to as "strategic partners." These Asian

countries displayed particular willingness to sustain a defense-centric relationship with either the United States or China. For the United States, these countries included Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Thailand, and the Philippines. Burma, North Korea, Pakistan, and Russia were China's strategic partners. After assessing the relationships between each military and its respective strategic partners, this section concluded that barring significant shifts in political climate or redirection of military diplomacy effort, the national interests binding each relationship would mostly likely continue to hold current relationships in place.

The third section examined four military diplomacy venues where the PLA matched or performed better than the U.S. military and assessed the implications to overall U.S. military diplomacy efforts in Asia. This section reasoned that there is no immediate threat to U.S. military diplomacy efforts in Asia because the United States' widespread capacity to conduct military diplomacy in the region still surpasses that of the PLA.

Finally, the last portion of this chapter addressed some important methodology concerns associated with how to measure the effectiveness of military diplomacy comprehensively in Asia. The purpose of this section is to present an alternative approach to measuring the impact of military diplomacy in Asia by introducing weighted values. In this elaborate alternative approach, weighted values can dramatically alter the way total impact is measured.

This chapter analyzed the observations yielded by the last chapter and concludes that the U.S. military's ability to conduct diplomacy in Asia remains strong. Even though the PLA is gaining competence as a military force, its capacity to conduct military diplomacy still remains limited when compared to the U.S. military. In this view, the U.S. military retains a margin of comfort for the time being. That said, the fourth section of this chapter attempted to emphasize the importance of not becoming complacent, based on the results offered by this research project, because a change in methodology can dramatically decrease whatever margin of comfort there may be between the U.S. military and PLA military diplomacy effectiveness.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. IMPLICATIONS

The previous chapter analyzed three trends: what causes the capability differential between the U.S. and Chinese militaries allowed the overall diplomacy activity level of the U.S. military to far exceed that of its Chinese counterparts; what is the nature of defense-centric relations between the United States and China with their respective strategic partners; and how the PLA's comparable or better performance in certain diplomacy activities will influence the U.S. military's overall diplomacy effort in Asia.

This chapter considers the implications of the trends with regard to the potential for increased competition, cooperation or conflict. The goal is to address the question: Does the current context surrounding the two military's diplomacy activities implicate any tendencies toward increased competition, cooperation, or conflict?

The fundamental reason for comparing U.S. and Chinese military diplomacy activities in Asia is to examine how the context formed by such activities influences the relationship between the U.S. military and the PLA (and to figure out how to more effectively conduct U.S. military diplomacy). After conducting a comparative analysis and analyzing the underlined general trends in U.S. and Chinese military diplomacy in Asia, potentials for competition, cooperation, and conflict collectively emerge. However, as this chapter suggests, the prospect for cooperation shines brightest because competition has associated negative consequences, conflict is not likely, and cooperation has many attractive qualities.

A. COMPETITION

The assertion that the military diplomacy activities of the U.S. military and the PLA will lead to increased competition in Asia is certainly plausible. First, although the superpower status of the United States currently affords the U.S. military an advantage in conducting military diplomacy, China is arguably closing the gap with increases in military diplomacy as the PLA's capabilities improve. Second, the U.S. military and PLA's close relationships with different Asian countries can potentially have polarizing

effects by creating pockets of allegiance throughout Asia. Finally, the PLA's use of different tools to engage many of the same countries the U.S. military interacts with may dilute the potency of U.S. influence. For these reasons, one can certainly argue for an increase in competition between the two militaries in conducting operations in Asia.

Many observers agree that the PLA's capabilities are improving. In this progression, the PLA's ability to challenge the U.S. military in all facets of military operations is growing. The military diplomacy realm is no exception. The PLA's diplomacy activity level is on the rise across the board from educational exchanges to joint military exercises. This dynamic has important implications for the relationships Washington and Beijing maintain with their respective defense partners. Whether bandwagoning or balancing, shifting power differentials between the U.S. and Chinese militaries may cause Asian countries to adjust current security relationships.

Asian countries often see China and the United States as rivals. Regimes in the region have, throughout history, maintained relationships with Beijing or Washington in order to achieve security and stability via Sino-U.S. tension. In the presence of China's mounting international power, the U.S. military remains a counterbalancing force in Asia. Despite the PRC's assurances of peaceful development, "many Asian countries remain wary of Beijing's intentions, and with good reasoning." China continues to offer support for repressive regimes in North Korea, Burma and Cambodia, which all increase the risk for instability and conflict. Chinese actions often "appear schizophrenic as it pursues contradictory policies. Mao called this 'walking on two legs,' the theory being that one can get to the destination faster using two different approaches at the same time."¹⁶⁹ The desire to hedge against this type of an approach is what makes a security relationship with the United States attractive.

To the benefit of Washington, Asian countries have good reason to see the United States as an attractive alternative. The U.S. military exerts influence in Asia through superior military projection capabilities. The nature of long-distance power projection is "viewed as a guarantee in two ways: geographical distance mutes its domination, and its

¹⁶⁹ Hugo Restall, "China's Bid for Asian Hegemony," *Far Eastern Economic Review* (May 2007): 3.

non-imperial history suggests the benignity of its power.”¹⁷⁰ The expectation is that China’s rise, balanced with U.S. dominance, will offer multiple opportunities in the strategic realm.¹⁷¹ In this view, the U.S. military’s relationships with its strategic partners and other Asian nations should remain fairly secure. However, the PLA factor cannot be disregarded.

Washington’s robust defense relationships in Asia offer no definitive assurances in the light of increased PLA capabilities. As noted in the previous chapter, the PLA also maintains strategic relationships and wide-ranging engagements through military diplomacy activities. This can obviously give reason for concern because, if left unchecked, PLA diplomacy efforts could erode the U.S. military’s influence in the region. As Saunders pointed out, the PLA’s military capabilities matter greatly inside Asia because Beijing consistently attempts to “deny Washington partners in any potential future effort to contain China.”¹⁷²

Saunders argues that, “geography and relative power dictate the focus of these efforts.” In this line of reasoning, China would be the most concerned about U.S. military presence in Central Asia and U.S. security ties with Taiwan because these bordering countries act as potential footholds for U.S. military actions. In addition, the PLA would also be concerned with Washington’s influence over traditional U.S. allies. These concerns appear to be validated by Beijing’s active attempts to build up defense relationships in Central Asia through the SCO, preponderant focus on fighting Taiwan, and increased efforts to improve relations with key U.S. allies such Thailand and the Philippines.¹⁷³

¹⁷⁰ Evelyn Goh, “Southeast Asian Perspectives on the China Challenge,” *The Journal of Strategic Studies* (August–October 2007): 813.

¹⁷¹ Alice Ba, “Southeast Asia and China,” in *Betwixt and Between: Southeast Asian Strategic Relations with U.S. and China* (Singapore: IDSS, 2005), 103.

¹⁷² Phillip C. Saunders, “China’s Global Activism: Strategy, Drivers, and Tools,” *Institute for National Strategic Studies Occasional Paper* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, October 2006), 10.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 7.

Finally, Beijing displays signs of evolving towards becoming a peer competitor of the U.S. military through new methods of engagement in building defense ties. The PLA now increasingly engages defense partners through formalized institutions such as the SCO and ARF—an approach traditionally most often employed by the U.S. military. In another long time practice of the U.S. military, the PLA now also reinforces security relationships by improving the infrastructure of its partners. China's direct support for the expansion of port facilities in Pakistan and Burma demonstrate this point. Finally yet importantly, like the U.S. military, the PLA has also established defense-related support facilities abroad, such as the signals intelligence collection facilities in Great Coco Islands (off the coast of Burma) and the satellite-tracking facilities in Pakistan.¹⁷⁴

Considered as a whole, the competition between U.S. and Chinese military diplomacy activities could indeed escalate. The PLA's improved operational capabilities support higher activity levels. These activities can easily be construed as actions to offset the U.S. military influence in the region. Furthermore, the PLA appears to be becoming more competent in exercising military diplomacy tools. All these signs may collectively lead to a suspicion that military diplomacy activities conducted by the U.S. and Chinese militaries, in Asia, will lead to increased competition between the two forces in their bids for influence.

B. COOPERATION

The current environment created by the collective diplomacy efforts of the U.S. and Chinese militaries contains opportunity for cooperation. As a starting point, a cooperative effort of diplomacy activities between the two militaries has the potential to impact Asia more comprehensively. Each military is unique in maintaining activity levels, engaging strategic partners and employing diplomacy methods. Combining the two efforts would tremendously enhance not only the sphere of influence, but also the

¹⁷⁴ Desmond Ball, "SIGINT Strengths Form a Vital Part of Burma's Military Muscle," *Jane's Intelligence Review*, March 1, 1998, 35; "Space Programme Facilities," *Chinese Defense Today*, www.sinodefence.com/space/facility/default.asp (accessed January 24, 2009); Brian Harvey, *China's Space Program* (Chichester: Praxis Publishing, 2004), 187; "13 Monitoring Stations to Ensure Successful Manned Spaceflight," *Xinhua News Service*, October 15, 2003, http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2003-10/15/content_1124282.htm (accessed January 26, 2009).

depth. This, of course, is contingent upon the fact that these two militaries can be united by some common aims. This section will argue that since common aims exist, there is opportunity for military cooperation to more comprehensively impact Asia through military diplomacy activities.

The different diplomacy activities of the U.S. and Chinese militaries can be collectivized. The U.S. military consistently upholds high levels of diplomacy activities in Asia. The PLA, although currently lagging behind, is increasing its activity levels. Given the same objectives, these two pools of activities can merge and provide an enhanced collective influence over Asia.

The current context of strategic defense alliances that the two militaries maintain also presents opportunities for cooperation. The U.S. military sustains better relations with Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Singapore, and arguably, Thailand. China connects better with Burma, North Korea, Russia, and for the most part, Pakistan. Collectively, the U.S. and Chinese militaries are strategic partners with most of the major defense players in Asia. In addition to the above-mentioned strategic partners, most Asian nations with a significant military capability all have deep-rooted defense ties to either Washington or Beijing. The ability to attain impact in Asia through collaboration between the U.S. military and the PLA would, therefore, be nothing short of spectacular.

In addition to cooperating on activity level engagement partners, the U.S. military and the PLA also have an opportunity to further enhance collective impact by exploiting the comparative advantage of how well each employs different engagement tools. The U.S. military has a notable advantage in conducting operational and tactical level engagements vis-à-vis high levels of interactions through conferences, joint exercises, and training events. The PLA tends to emphasize strategic level interactions more and is better entrenched in cooperation through regional organizations and conducting peacekeeping operations. The difference stemming from how the two militaries conduct military diplomacy provides opportunity for cooperation because different target countries may be more receptive to one approach over the other. Having a wider range of approaches presents the capability to reach out to Asia more effectively.

The potentials for improving cooperation on the military diplomacy front described above are encapsulated by having common interests. The main pillar of these common interests is a unified desire on the part of both Washington and Beijing to bring stability to the region. Stability in Asia is a strong unifying interest because it is in the interest of both countries.

From Beijing's perspective, maintaining a peaceful environment is important for achieving domestic economic and social development. For this reason, China must avoid conflict. To do so, China should be willing to forge common understandings with the United States on regional security and adopt "complementary policies or even partnerships on global issues that are important to both countries, such as the war on terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and environmental protection."¹⁷⁵ In fact, Chinese officials have repeatedly reassured Washington that "China regards the U.S. military presence in Asia as a stabilizing factor and does not seek to push the United States out of Asia."¹⁷⁶ This is, conceivably, an indication of a willingness to cooperate on security matters within Asia.

Even if an inclination to cooperate does not exist on a genuine level, Beijing still has reason to play a partnership role with Washington. Some observers note that the CCP has more broadly "preached the gospel of 'multipolarity' in international politics and sought to promote strategic partnerships with other centers of power to balance American hegemony." However, such efforts have largely been unsuccessful because "most of Beijing's potential partners, like China itself, depend on cooperative relationships with the United States, much as they may chafe at American dominance in the international system."¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁵ Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, "U.S.-China Relations: An Affirmative Agenda, A Responsible Course," 2007, <http://www.cfr.org> (accessed February 9, 2009).

¹⁷⁶ Phillip C. Saunders, "China's Global Activism: Strategy, Drivers, and Tools," *Institute for National Strategic Studies Occasional Paper* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, October 2006), 6.

¹⁷⁷ Alice L. Miller, "CHINA: A Superpower? No Time Soon," *Hoover Digest: Research and Opinion on Public Policy*, 2005, <http://www.hoover.org/publications/digest/2938796.html> (accessed February 11, 2009).

Washington shares Beijing's desire to keep peace in the region. With the predominance of U.S. military focus currently dedicated to OIF and OEF, resources are scarce and must be employed effectively. The most effective method is, of course, to avert conflict. A RAND report comments on the importance of using military engagement to enhance stability in Central Asia, but the theme can easily be carried across to all of Asia. As the authors note,

The most important objective that military engagement can serve is to help preserve and enhance regional stability and development...The U.S. goal, then, is to remain aware of actors and developments and to seek to help the region avoid, for example, (1) political instability that could lead to state failure and widespread unrest; (2) the emergence of regimes fundamentally opposed to U.S. interests, such as the Taliban were in Afghanistan; and (3) outright interstate conflict.¹⁷⁸

With a cohesive interest to bring stability to the region in mind, Sino-U.S. military ties have been improving. Even though "the old concerns remain for both sides (Beijing's lack of budgetary transparency, Washington's weapon sales to Taiwan), the overall trend is toward closer ties between the Pentagon and the PLA." U.S. and Chinese forces staging their first joint search-and-rescue maneuvers in the Pacific and South China Sea in 2006, and Washington downplaying the unexpected surfacing of a Chinese submarine near a U.S. aircraft carrier later that year, serve as good indications of the warming trend. Providing further indications, a military-to-military hotline was established in April 2008 to prevent potential misunderstandings as Beijing begins to project its military power beyond its littoral waters. Beijing even attempted to address some transparency issues by launching the Information Office of the Ministry of National Defense, which regularly releases military information and holds press conferences, and rejoined the UN Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures in 2007.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁸ RAND Corporation, "Defining U.S. Interests in Central Asia," 2005, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG338.pdf (accessed December 11, 2008), 45-46.

¹⁷⁹ Adam Wolfe, "China: New Defense Posture," *New York for ISN Security Watch*, February 2, 2009, <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/Security-Watch/Detail/?lng=en&id=95974> (accessed February 9, 2009).

The equation for possible cooperation consists of two important parts—capability and will. From a capability perspective, a joint effort without doubt enhances the capacity to generate impact in Asia through military diplomacy. In the will part of the equation, the U.S. and Chinese militaries have a collective interest in maintaining stability in Asia. This common interest, in turn, provides common will for the two militaries to achieve the same end. The two militaries’ overtures toward each other through improved cooperation already validate an existing potential for further cooperative developments.

C. CONFLICT

A conflict between the U.S. military and the PLA is obviously an undesirable scenario. Hence, it is important to scrutinize the two countries’ military diplomacy in Asia in order to assess whether the two militaries’ interactions with other Asian nations can increase the potential for conflict with each other. In this assessment, this section finds that although select defense-centric activities of both countries can certainly become significant friction points, the Taiwan issue remains a possible flashpoint that could ignite large-scale conflict between the U.S. military and the PLA.

Certain security relationships the U.S. military and the PLA sustain with respective security partners have the tendency to instigate a constant level of tension between each other. Although these tensions may lead proxy conflicts or strong statements of disagreement, they are unlikely to escalate into direct military confrontation between the United States and China. Different relationships on the Korean peninsula, in the India-Pakistan competition, and with Japan, are sources of such constant tensions. Beijing maintains close relations with Pyongyang and Washington with Seoul but most observers would agree that if conflict breaks out on the peninsula, it is unlikely that the U.S. military and the PLA will directly fight each other as they did during the Korean War. The same concept can be applied to the U.S. military’s relationship with Indian forces and the PLA’s with Pakistan. Some may also note that China sometimes criticizes U.S. relations with Japan. Even though these issues seem to reverberate constantly in the background, the level of noises does not seem indicative of serious potential for direct

conflict. Beyond these instances, however, lies an issue that has the highest potential for drawing the United States and China into direct combat with each other, and that is Taiwan.

The United States maintains an active defense relationship with Taiwan through various military diplomacy activities. Continuing to maintain a healthy relationship with Taiwan is important because other states in the region “view Washington’s commitment to cross-strait peace and stability as an important symbol of America’s strategic interest in East Asia, and would view any diminution of that interest with concern.”¹⁸⁰ In recent years, the U.S. military engaged Taiwan’s armed forces through various defense diplomacy tools. In the period from 2005 to 2007, the U.S. military activities, with Taiwanese counterparts, included twenty-two conferences, 53 military-to-military contacts, four FMS deals, 14 high-level visits, three exercises, and 30 education/PME exchanges. Beijing has strong opinions regarding this relationship.¹⁸¹

As an independent task force sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations concluded, “Taiwan remains a potential flash point in East Asia. It is the only issue over which leaders of both China and the United States contemplate and conscientiously prepare for armed conflict.”¹⁸² This is because China views U.S. commitments to Taiwan’s security, especially through the provision of defense goods and services, as an unwelcome intrusion into China’s internal affairs. Today, as it was 35 years ago, “Taiwan remains a top concern of China’s leaders, and it is never far from their minds when they consider their relations with the United States.”¹⁸³ This is reflected in China’s 2008

¹⁸⁰ Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-China Relations: An Affirmative Agenda, A Responsible Course,” 2007, <http://www.cfr.org> (accessed February 9, 2009), 42.

¹⁸¹ PACOM TSCMIS Yearly Assessments FY2005–FY2007.

¹⁸² Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-China Relations: An Affirmative Agenda, A Responsible Course,” 39.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 40.

Defense White Papers where U.S. weapon sales to Taiwan and increased military presence in the Asia-Pacific region are still cited as top security concerns for China.¹⁸⁴

Conflicting military objectives over Taiwan creates a “powerful dynamic of mistrust” and could lead to a conflict neither intended nor desired by either side. As the CFR sponsored task force concludes, “Until some level of political accommodation is reached in cross-strait relations, even on an interim basis, Washington and Beijing have to continue to manage their differences on Taiwan rather than resolve them.”¹⁸⁵ In the context of the current situation, Taiwan remains the sole sticking point between Beijing and Washington that can potentially bring about direct military confrontation.

1. The Optimistic Future Prospect

Military diplomacy builds relationships by fulfilling or accommodating the needs or desires of security partners. While military diplomacy can be an effective tool in some situations, the extent of its utility, like any other tool, may diminish in others. Military diplomacy is most likely to be effective in reducing the potentials for conflict resulting from mutual uncertainties with regard to each other’s intentions, the threatening potential of other states’ military power or historically inherited mistrust. The effectiveness of military diplomacy in fostering cooperative relationships become more limited in situations where potentials for conflict result from specific “real and substantive political differences, whether over specific issues such as territory and borders or over wider questions such as the norms underpinning international politics or the international balance of power.”¹⁸⁶ From this perspective, this section proposes that there are optimistic prospects for future cooperation between the U.S. and Chinese militaries in conducting diplomatic activities in Asia.

¹⁸⁴ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, “China's National Defense in 2008,” January 20, 2009, http://www.china.org.cn/government/whitepaper/node_7060059.htm (accessed February 9, 2009).

¹⁸⁵ Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-China Relations: An Affirmative Agenda, A Responsible Course,” 2007, <http://www.cfr.org> (accessed February 9, 2009), 42.

¹⁸⁶ Andrew Cottey and Anthony Forster, “Strategic Engagement: Defence Diplomacy as a Means of Conflict Prevention,” *Adelphi Papers* (2004): 15–30.

The optimism for cooperative prospects is based on three lines of reasoning. First, while there may be some benefit to be gained through direct competition in conducting military diplomacy activities, the margin of benefits are small because security partners are unlikely to significantly alter the stance on major political issues framing individual security concerns. Second, until the PLA's capabilities reach peer competitor status with respect to U.S. military capabilities, direct military confrontation would be an irrational and costly choice. Finally, having common objectives in Asia, combined with China's desire to develop a more international role, should encourage cooperation between the U.S. and Chinese militaries.

Competing with the U.S. military through employing the tools of military diplomacy is not in Beijing's best interest. As previously noted, the PLA engages in security relations with many of the same Asian countries as the U.S. military. Since strategic national interests underpin most of these relationships, drastic shifts in the climate of current relationships are unlikely. While China has increased its frequency of defense-centric activities with traditional U.S. security partners such as Japan, South

Korea, the Philippines, Singapore and India, such activities are not likely to alter the political reasons these countries have for maintaining close ties to the United States. In this view, the PLA's diplomacy efforts reduce the potential for conflict with these countries but do not have significant impact in degrading U.S. ties to the same countries. China has to keep these dynamics in mind when conducting military diplomacy because hyperactivity from the PLA could result in a net loss in influence.

The PLA must be diligent in its activities because an overly aggressive diplomacy effort can cause negative consequences. While developing security relations with a specific country may reduce conflict with that particular country, an overly aggressive effort may be construed as threatening to the U.S. military and other countries in the region as well. Beijing is very well aware that external threat perceptions can prompt balancing or containment policies against China. China's "Peaceful Rise" and later "Peaceful Development" slogans reflect this awareness. From this perspective, the PLA has no reason to provoke competition with the U.S. military through its diplomatic ties with security partners.

The PLA also has no reason to provoke an all out military confrontation with the U.S. military. While the PLA has undertaken tremendous military modernization, its forces are still not in a position to confront the U.S. military. As the CFR reports, “China is making progress toward being able to fight and win a war with Taiwan (absent U.S. intervention), and it is also beginning to build capabilities to safeguard its growing global interests.”¹⁸⁷ While these capabilities, including anti-satellite systems, pose challenges for the United States, there is no evidence to support the notion that China will become a peer military competitor of the United States. In the words of a CFR task force,

By virtue of its heritage and experience, its equipment and level of technology, its personnel, and the resources it spends, the United States enjoys space, air, and naval superiority over China. The military balance today and for the foreseeable future strongly favors the United States and its allies.¹⁸⁸

The PLA is well aware of this capability differential, and consequently, will see it as a deterrent in the process of considering full-scale military conflict. This is, of course, not to say that a power differential alone will guarantee conflict aversion.

Beijing must consider other imperatives in its decision-making process. One of the most frequent arguments advocated by authors such as Susan Shirk suggests that hyper-nationalism among Chinese citizens can force Beijing into conflict. The basic premise is that the CCP employs nationalism as a tool to unite the population in a way that spring-loads the Chinese people for over-reaction on certain issues (i.e., incidents with Taiwan). The argument is reasonable and should be carefully considered. However, this is simply suggesting that barring any unforeseen catastrophic events that arouse reactions beyond the crises management capabilities of the CCP, cooperation on all fronts, including military diplomacy, is a more attractive option for Beijing.

Cooperating with the U.S. military in exerting influence in Asia offers Beijing important benefits. China’s military capabilities are improving, but are still constrained

¹⁸⁷ Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-China Relations: An Affirmative Agenda, A Responsible Course,” 2007, <http://www.cfr.org> (accessed February 9, 2009), 54.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

by some inherent limitations including power projection capability. Hence, with stability on its periphery, and in the region in general still being a primary concern, China has no reason to reject U.S. presence in Asia completely. For the sake of stability, the two militaries can collectively engage in numerous issues.

The interest of maintaining stability in Asia presents Washington and Beijing with compatible agendas. Both the United States and China continue to have common stakes in “maintaining stability in the perennially crisis-prone areas of the Korean peninsula and the Taiwan Strait, where the recent warming of relations has reduced the tensions in trilateral interactions that characterized Chen Shui-bian’s presidency.” In addition, China’s long-standing relationship with Pakistan provides “promising foundations for progress” under the new U.S. administration.¹⁸⁹

Beyond the common interests above, Beijing has additional reasons to cooperate with Washington on military matters. China’s cooperation with the United States in the realm of military diplomacy will also help usher China more squarely into the international spotlight. Beijing has apparent ambitions to emerge into a more significant international role. China’s most recent white papers clearly emphasize China’s new place in the world. The document describes the country as an indispensable nation: “China cannot develop in isolation from the rest of the world, nor can the world enjoy prosperity and stability without China.” As Adam Wolfe notes in his article “China: New Defense Posture,” “While this emphasis is likely to cause concern in capitals around the world, it also opens the door for greater cooperation with China’s neighbors and the U.S.”¹⁹⁰

This section has argued that the prospects for future Sino-U.S. cooperation in Asia are optimistic. This optimism rests on three reasons. The first is that competition can have negative impacts. The PLA would only be disadvantaged by increased competition if such actions lead to balancing or containment strategies from the United States and neighbors. Second, the PLA is not likely to challenge the U.S. military in direct conflict

¹⁸⁹ Jacques deLisle, “America’s Role in East Asia,” <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/Security-Watch/Detail/?lng=en&id=95997> (accessed February 9, 2009).

¹⁹⁰ Adam Wolfe, “China: New Defense Posture,” *New York for ISN Security Watch*, February 2, 2009, <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/Security-Watch/Detail/?lng=en&id=95974> (accessed February 9, 2009).

because its capabilities remain inferior. While there may be more imperative reasons for choosing conflict in catastrophic scenarios, cooperation is a far more attractive alternative. Finally, common interests provide both the United States and PRC motivation for improving military cooperation in conducting diplomacy in Asia. Both countries have a stake in regional stability and China has additional motivation stemming from Beijing's desire to fulfill a larger international role.

2. Summary

The diplomacy activity gap between the U.S. military and PLA is narrowing. While the U.S. military has and continues to sustain a high level of diplomacy activities via security cooperation relationships in Asia, the PLA is certainly expanding its influence through increased activities. After comparing how the two militaries engaged in defense-centric relationships in Asia, and analyzing what motivated those patterns, this chapter assessed what implications these defense diplomacy activities hold for the future of military-to-military relations between the United States and China. The assessment finds that the context created by current activities and relationships can offer persuasive supporting evidence for competition, cooperation, or conflict. However, the prospect for cooperation appears the most evident. While competition can offer marginal benefits by improving relationships with specific nations, associated negative threat perceptions negate net gains in consolidating influence. Even though conflict over central security differences can arise, either country stands to benefit and the PLA's deficit in capability will surely lead to a costly conclusion. In contrast to both militaries suffering unconstructive consequences in a direct confrontation, regional cooperation through the realm of conduction, military diplomacy stands to benefit both the United States and China by bringing enhanced stability to the region via a consolidated ability to exert influence throughout Asia. In this view, cooperation between the U.S. and Chinese militaries is not only likely, but also the most rational choice.

V. CONCLUSION

The inspiration for this thesis stemmed from a desire to grasp the potential implications better of the PLA's improving capabilities. While the capability developments of the PLA have occurred across many facets, one particular area, military diplomacy, captured this author's interest. Along with China's growing ability to exert influence in the world, the PLA is demonstrating increased aptitude for functioning as an instrument of diplomacy. Since the PLA's global force projection capacity still remains limited, its diplomatic efforts are most evident in Asia. This circumstance provided the departure point of this research project, which was to examine how the PLA's diplomacy efforts in Asia can potentially impact the U.S. military's corresponding efforts within the same region.

Using military diplomacy, the PLA is increasingly interacting with more of the same Asian countries the U.S. military engages through security relationships. In this context, the expanding scope of the PLA's diplomatic activities can redefine not only U.S. security relationships with Asian countries, but also Sino-U.S. military relations. The ultimate aim of this thesis was to assess how Sino-U.S. military relations will be affected by the simultaneous diplomacy efforts of both militaries—will the PLA's increased level of diplomacy activities shift the Sino-U.S. military relationship towards competition, cooperation, or conflict?

Chapter I set the stage for the research effort with two significant steps. It defined the diplomacy objectives of both the U.S. and Chinese militaries by tracing through the various inputs each military received from their respective governing authorities. The role of U.S. military diplomacy that emerges from the objectives outlined by the *NSS*, *Strategic Plan*, *NDS*, and *NMS*, is to support U.S. foreign policy by shaping a global environment that promotes security and deters conflict through building alliances, diffusing regional conflicts, promoting international understanding, and strengthening diplomatic and program capabilities. The PLA's objectives, framed by the policies of the CPC, Foreign Ministry, and CMC, are summarized as strengthening China's ability to

preserve sovereignty and territorial integrity, create a favorable international environment for China's economic growth, and expand Chinese participation in shaping the world's security environment.

In addition to outlining the diplomatic objectives of the two militaries, Chapter I also outlined how defense diplomacy activities will be categorized in the comparison process. All the activities falling under the military diplomacy umbrella were separated into four broad categories: Strategic-level activities, regional activities, professional military exchanges, and cooperation on non-traditional security areas. Each category encompassed specific activities that served as the framework for organizing activities constituted as military diplomacy.¹⁹¹

After setting the stage in Chapter I, the following chapter summarized and compared the defense diplomacy activities conducted by both the U.S. and Chinese militaries. Through this process, disparities in three particular areas emerged—the overall activity level, choices in strategic engagement partners, and preferred diplomacy tools. In overall activity level, the volume of U.S. military diplomacy activities was far higher than that of its Chinese counterparts. In the realm of maintaining strategic partners, political interests provided dense security ties between the U.S. military and Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. Similar relationships existed between the PLA and Pakistan, Russia, Burma and North Korea. In the effort to sustain security relationships, the U.S. military took a well-balanced approach to exercising all the tools available under the umbrella of military diplomacy. The PLA efforts were less balanced and particularly concentrated on conducting defense consultations and strategic dialogues, state-to-state military protocols, participation in regional forums, and peacekeeping operations. The level of focus in these areas allowed the PLA to either match or exceed U.S. performance in the same areas.

Upon observing the differences that emerged from the comparison, Chapter III analyzed the differences in detail by examining the reasons for such differences. The

¹⁹¹ These categories are outlined by Kristen Gunness. See Kristen Gunness, "China's Military Diplomacy in an Era of Change," June 20, 2006, www.ndu.edu/inss/symposia/pacific2006/gunnesspaper.pdf (accessed March 1, 2008).

detailed examination revealed three observations. First, the overall military diplomacy activity level disparity between the U.S. and Chinese militaries can be attributed to disproportions in military capabilities between the two forces. The U.S. military affords the United States power projection capabilities commensurate with that of a superpower. The PLA does not have comparable resources and therefore is not able to match U.S. performances across all defense diplomacy activities. Second, vital national interests of defense partners underpin the strategic defense relationships maintained by both militaries. This implies that barring significant shifts in political climates or adjustments to current military diplomacy efforts, the security relationships between the U.S. and Chinese militaries and their respective security remain in place. With the exception of Thailand and Pakistan, most U.S. or Chinese strategic partners appear to be deeply rooted in their security relationships with either military. Third, there is no immediate threat to U.S. military diplomacy efforts in Asia because the United States' widespread capacity to conduct military diplomacy in the region still surpasses that of the PLA. While the PLA's efforts are notable in some diplomacy activities, the U.S. military is still dominating most of diplomacy activities.

Once the differences were analyzed in detail, Chapter IV assessed the implications the activities had on increasing the potential for competition, cooperation or conflict between the U.S. and Chinese militaries. The assessment found that while the context created by current activities and relationships offered persuasive evidence for competition, cooperation and conflict, the evidence suggesting further cooperation appeared the most evident. Competition had marginal benefits to offer by improving relationships with specific nations. However, associated negative consequences, most predominantly, increased threat perceptions, negated net gains in enhancing net influence, making increased competition an unproductive, and hence, undesirable approach. Conflict would be an even more undesirable approach because both the United States and China stand to lose from conflict. For China, the inferior military capabilities of the PLA would lead to costly losses. For the United States, becoming involved in a conflict with China undermines its credibility as a stabilizing force in Asia. The negative qualities of competition and conflict imply that regional cooperation through military

diplomacy affords both countries the best opportunity to enhance stability in the region and consolidate influence throughout Asia. After all, stability is consistent with the military diplomacy objectives of both the U.S. and Chinese militaries.

A. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In addressing China's increased activism in employing the PLA as a diplomatic tool, varying policy approaches can yield significantly different results. Consequently, formulating coherent policies is crucial. Based on the analysis of this research project, the most ideal U.S. military response in the current situation is to pursue a policy that encourages a contingent-based cooperative military-to-military relationship with the PLA.

A contingent-based cooperative approach mirrors Former Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick's idea of inviting China to become a "responsible stakeholder."¹⁹² Acknowledging China's emergences on the world stage, Zoellick emphasized the importance of China's character and content in projecting global influence.¹⁹³ He called on China to assume more responsibility in upholding international rules, norms, and organizations. In exchange, China would gain greater influence in working with the United States "to Shape the future international system."¹⁹⁴ Observers agree, "Playing the role of a responsible stakeholder would not only advance China's national interests, but also allow Beijing to pursue a larger regional and global role without sparking a destabilizing competition with Washington."¹⁹⁵ Zoellick also emphasized that the United States and China should cooperate in pursuing common interests because cooperation can provide common benefits, including benefits with regard to improved security.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹² Robert Zoellick, "Whither China: From Membership to Responsibility?," <http://merln.ndu.edu/archivepdf/china/State/53682.pdf> (accessed February 9, 2009).

¹⁹³ James J. Przystup and Phillip C. Saunders, "Visions of Order: Japan and China in U.S. Strategy," *Strategic Forum* (National Defense University), June 2006, 3.

¹⁹⁴ Robert Zoellick, "Whither China: From Membership to Responsibility?"

¹⁹⁵ Przystup and Saunders, "Visions of Order: Japan and China in U.S. Strategy," 3.

¹⁹⁶ Zoellick, "Whither China: From Membership to Responsibility?"

A CFR task force echoes the recommendation for increased cooperation. The Task Force finds that U.S. strategy toward China should be focused on “an affirmative agenda of integrating China into the global community, thereby helping to shape China’s self-interest in ways that will build on areas of existing cooperation and create new opportunities for collaboration on regional and global challenges.” In the task force’s view, integration is the responsible course.¹⁹⁷ The level of integration should, of course, be contingent upon China’s increased responsible behavior.

Along this line of thought, China’s behavior in recent years provides good motivation for improving integration and cooperation. Beijing has already demonstrated increased responsibility in conducting defense-centric interactions in recent years. From the 1980s through the mid-1990s, arms sales and exports of technology for weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and ballistic missiles were important sources of Chinese influence. In great contrast, China now has a predominantly conventional military technology and places greater emphasis on military diplomacy and capacity-building programs.¹⁹⁸ China’s overall global arms exports have declined dramatically—from a high point in 1987 of \$5.8 billion to only \$300 million in 2003 and \$600 million in 2004.¹⁹⁹

Replacing the diminishing activities in arm sales is China’s increasing emphasis on military diplomacy. China has stepped up its military diplomacy activities dramatically since late 2001. According to China’s 2008 Defense White Paper,

China has established military ties with over 150 countries, and has military attaché offices in 109 countries. A total of 98 countries have military attaché offices in China. In the past two years senior PLA

¹⁹⁷ Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-China Relations: An Affirmative Agenda, A Responsible Course,” 2007, <http://www.cfr.org> (accessed February 9, 2009).

¹⁹⁸ Phillip C. Saunders, “China’s Global Activism: Strategy, Drivers, and Tools,” *Institute for National Strategic Studies Occasional Paper* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, October 2006), 16.

¹⁹⁹ Richard F. Grimmett, *Conventional Arms Transfers to the Third World, 1986-1993*, (Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 1994), 92; Richard F. Grimmett, *Conventional Arms Transfers to Developing Nations, 1997–2004* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2005), 41.

delegations have visited more than 40 countries, and defense ministers and chiefs of the general staff from more than 60 countries have visited China.²⁰⁰

In this view, China's method to building defense ties has become less threatening and more cooperative by employing less hardware-based and more relationship-based approaches. China's new style better conforms to the international stands Zoellick spoke of in his 2005 speech and therefore displays increased indications of becoming a "responsible stakeholder."

Based on the movement towards becoming more responsible as a stakeholder, U.S. policy should honor the contingent-based understanding by affording China greater international roles. Military policy governing military diplomacy ought to, therefore, reflect corresponding gestures. From this perspective, the U.S. military should accommodate a great PLA role in Asia through increased regional cooperation. The 2007 Council Task Force report reflects this line of reasoning by proposing that the best way for the United States to ensure that its security interests in the region are not compromised by China's growing military capabilities is to strengthen security alliances with China's neighbors in the effort to help draw China into constructive security relationships.²⁰¹ China's new roles in constructive relationships can then facilitate achieving common interests in Asia with the U.S. military.

B. AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This thesis suggests two additional areas for study to further perpetuate better understanding of military diplomacy. First, further research efforts into which countries or regions associate the most importance can aid the better understanding of military diplomacy effectiveness. As indicated in Chapter IV, attaching weighted values to

²⁰⁰ People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council, "China's National Defense in 2008," January 20, 2009, http://www.china.org.cn/government/whitepaper/node_7060059.htm (accessed February 9, 2009), 49.

²⁰¹ Jayshree Bajoria, "Countering China's Military Modernization," *CFR Background*, February 4, 2009, http://www.cfr.org/publication/9052/countering_chinas_military_modernization.html?breadcrumb=%2Fpublication%2Fby_type%2Fbackgrounder (accessed February 9, 2009).

different military diplomacy tools can greatly affect how resulting impact is measured. The resources supporting military diplomacy, like any other resources, are limited. Consequently, a significant effort should be made towards understanding how resources can be employed most effectively in garnering desired impact. Ascertaining a thorough understanding ensures the most efficient opportunities to gain the greatest amount of effectiveness while expending the least amount of resources.

The quest for comprehensive efficiency will be a daunting task indeed. Defense diplomacy is about building relationships by catering to the needs and desires of partnering countries or regions. Since the needs and desires of countries and regions are likely to vary, one must seek to understand what issues are the most important to specific countries or regions, and furthermore, understand those issues from the partner country or region's perspective.

In applying this concept to Asia, a research effort should attempt to determine accurate country-specific weighted values for each defense diplomacy activity. The study should start with the most influential players in Asia, such as Japan, China, and South Korea. This effort would help shape the future course of U.S. military diplomacy activities and would enable a more meaningful comparison of diplomacy efforts between the U.S. and Chinese militaries.

The second area of study deals with refining the estimation of PLA defense diplomacy activities within the context of current underpinning issues—specifically the global economic downturn. The basic question is how will the global economic slowdown affect PLA diplomacy efforts? The PLA's resources are becoming scarcer, which constrains the PLA's budget for additional capability enhancements, thereby possibly directly affecting PLA diplomacy activities. Furthermore, the PLA has a mandate to assist in maintaining domestic stability. In the face of China's economic downturn, socioeconomic disturbances within China may rise and force the PLA to redirect its already limited resources. In this sense, the economic situation of the current times both directly and indirectly limits the PLA's ability to continue expanding defense

diplomacy activities. Therefore, the PLA may be forced to prepare for budget cuts and integrate diplomacy activities with preparations for increased possibilities for domestic unrest.

The PLA, already to some extent, integrates defense diplomacy and domestic stability interest. For example, the PLA's cooperation through the SCO in conducting anti-terrorism exercises affords China the chance to build defense relations while preparing for civil unrest concurrently. Beijing attaches tremendous significance to such issues, as reflected through its reiterates on the need to fight against the three isms—extremism, terrorism and separatism. The question is how much more integration can take place before Beijing must start making concessions in the defense diplomacy realm in order to address domestic stability issues? Furthermore, what implications will Beijing's decisions have for U.S. military diplomacy efforts in Asia? If Washington starts to engage Beijing in a partnership capacity in conducting military diplomacy, what potential implications will arise from the PLA role amidst changing circumstances?

Further research efforts are required to determine the answers to the above questions. The areas for further study proposed by this thesis should help perpetuate the continuous effort to understand military diplomacy against the backdrop of Sino-U.S. military relations. Whether from the policymakers' perspective or the perspective of a military officer, developing and maintaining such understandings is imperative in engaging one of the world's most capable military forces.

APPENDIX A. ARMS TRANSFERS

A. U.S. ARMS TRANSFERS

Transfers of major conventional weapons: sorted by recipient. Deals with deliveries or orders made for year range 2001 to 2007

Note: The 'No. delivered/produced' and the 'Year(s) of deliveries' columns refer to all deliveries since the beginning of the contract. Deals in which the recipient was involved in the production of the weapon system are listed separately. The 'Comments' column includes publicly reported information on the value of the deal. Information on the sources and methods used in the collection of the data, and explanations of the conventions, abbreviations and acronyms, can be found at URL <<http://armstrade.sipri.org/>>. The SIPRI Arms Transfers Database is continuously updated as new information becomes available.

Source: SIPRI Arms Transfers Database

Information generated: 24 November 2008

Recipient/ supplier (S) or licensor (L)	No. ordered	Weapon designation	Weapon description	Year of order/ licence	Year(s) of deliveries	No. delivered/ produced	Comments
Brunei S: USA	(19)	BTA-5.9	Diesel engine (AV)	(2002)	2003-2004	(19)	For modernization of 16 Scorpion tanks, 2 Sultan APC/CP and 1 Samson ARV; ordered via UK
India S: USA	122 (6)	TPE-331 LM-2500	Turboprop Gas turbine (SH)	1983 (1999)	1986-2006	(102)	For 61 Do-228 MP aircraft from FRG For 3 Shivalik (Project-17) frigates produced in India; possibly from Italian production line
	8	AN/TPQ-37 Firefinder	Arty locating radar	2002	2006	8	Part of \$142-190 m deal; originally planned for 1998 but embargoed by USA after Indian nuclear tests in 1998; AN/TPQ-37(V)3 version

	4	AN/TPQ-37 Firefinder	Arty locating radar	2003	2006-2007	4	Part of \$142-190 m deal; AN/TPQ-37(V)3 version
	4	LM-2500	Gas turbine (SH)	(2003)			For 1 IAC (ADS) aircraft carrier produced in India; probably from Italian production line
	17	F-404	Turbofan	2004			\$105 m deal; for Tejas (LCA) combat aircraft produced in India; F404-GE-IN20 version; ordered after Indian Kaveri engine delayed
	1	Austin	AALS	2006	2007	1	Ex-US; INR2.2 b (\$48 m) deal (incl modernization)
	6	S-61R/HH-3E/F	Helicopter	2006	2007	(6)	Ex-US; \$39 m deal; UH-3H version; del 2007
	6	C-130J Hercules-2	Transport aircraft	(2007)			\$1 b deal; contract not yet signed
	(24)	F-404	Turbofan	2007			For Tejas (LCA) combat aircraft produced in India, F-404-GE-F2J3 version
<hr/>							
Indonesia							
S: USA							
	48	CT-7	Turboprop	(1990)	1993-2004	(48)	For 24 CN-235 transport and CN-235MPA MP aircraft produced in Indonesia; CT-7-9C3 version
	16	AN/APG-66	Aircraft radar	1996	1999-2007	(16)	For 16 Hawk-200 combat aircraft from UK; status of last 6 uncertain after US arms embargo during 1999-2006 against Indonesia
	1	F-5E Tiger-2	FGA aircraft	(1996)	2006	1	Second-hand; modernized in USA; delivery embargoed by USA 1999-2006
	8	Caterpillar-3516	Diesel engine (SH)	(2000)	2002-2005	(8)	For modernization of 4 Parchim (Patimura) corvettes
<hr/>							
Japan							
S: USA							
	..	F-110	Turbofan	(1987)	2000-2007	(85)	For F-2 combat aircraft produced in Japan; F-110-GE-129 version
	(38)	Mk-15 Phalanx	CIWS	(1993)	1996-2007	(38)	For 2 Improved Kongou destroyers, 9 Murasame and 5 Takanami frigates and 3 Oosumi AALS produced in Japan; incl some Block-1B version
	6	LCAC	Landing craft	1994	1997-2002	(6)	
	(56)	AE-2100	Turboprop	(1996)	2007	8	For 14 US-2 (US-1AKai) MP aircraft produced in Japan; AE-2100J version
	(20)	King Air-350/C-12S	Light transport ac	1997	1999-2007	(13)	Incl for reconnaissance; Japanese designation LR-2
	40	AIM-120B AMRAAM	BVRAAM	(1998)	2001-2003	(40)	Deal worth \$22 m
	(16)	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	1999	2001	(16)	
	(13)	AN/APS-145	AEW aircraft radar	2000	2004-2007	(10)	For modernization of 13 E-2C AEW&C aircraft to Hawkeye-2000
	2	Gulfstream-5	Transport aircraft	2001	2003-2004	(2)	Deal worth \$100 m; modified in Netherlands before delivery to long-range MP aircraft; for Coast Guard; incl for use against piracy in South-East Asia

	16	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	2001	2003	16	\$27 m deal; possibly SM-2 Block-3B version
	(16)	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	(2001)	2003	16	\$27 m deal; SM-2 Block-3A version
	6	AN/SPG-62	Fire control radar	(2002)	2007	3	For 2 Improved Kongou/Atagou destroyers produced in Japan; for use with Standard SAM
	2	AN/SPY-1D	Air surv radar	2002	2007	1	For 2 Improved Kongou/Atagou destroyers produced in Japan
	(400)	BGM-71F TOW-2B	Anti-tank missile	2002	2003-2004	(400)	Part of \$52 m deal; TOW-2A/TOW-2B version
	16	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	(2002)	2004	(16)	\$24 m deal; SM-2 Block-3A version
	..	FIM-92 Stinger	Portable SAM	(2003)	2006-2007	(30)	AIM-92 version; for AH-64D combat helicopters
	4	KC-767	Tanker/transport ac	2003			'KC-X' programme; KC-767J version; delivery 2008-2010
	18	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	(2003)			SM-2 Block-3B version
	..	RIM-162 ESSM	SAM	2004			For Takanami and Murasame frigates
	(32)	MIM-104 PAC-3	SAM	2005	2006-2007	(32)	Part of \$6.5-9.3 b anti-ballistic missile defence system
	40	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	(2005)			SM-2 Block-3B version
	44	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	(2006)			\$70 m deal; SM-2 Block-3B version
L:	(80)	T-64	Turboprop	(1970)	1975-2005	(80)	For 20 US-1A MP aircraft produced in Japan, T-64-IHI-10J version
	210	Hughes-500E/M	Light helicopter	1977	1978-2001	(210)	OH-6D and OH-6DA version; incl for training
	86	CH-47D Chinook	Helicopter	1984	1986-2007	(83)	CH-47J and CH-47JA version; 84 produced in Japan
	(62)	LM-2500	Gas turbine (SH)	(1988)	1993-2007	47	For 2 FD aircraft-carriers, 4 Kongou and 2 Improved Kongou/Atagou destroyers, 5 Takanami and 9 Murasame frigates and 1 Asuka research ship produced in Japan
	(147)	S-70B/SH-60B Seahawk	ASW helicopter	1988	1991-2007	(127)	SH-60J and SH-60K version
	(67)	S-70/UH-60L Blackhawk	Helicopter	1988	1990-2007	(57)	S-70A-12/UH-60J version
	(27)	SeaVue	MP aircraft radar	1992	1995-2007	(27)	For 27 BAe-125-800/RH-800 (U-125A) MP aircraft from UK and USA
	(350)	AIM-7M Sparrow	BVRAAM	1993	1996-2006	(350)	For Murasame and Takanami frigates; RIM-7M Sea Sparrow (SAM) version
	(90)	M-270 MLRS 227mm	MRL	1993	1995-2006	(90)	
	(21)	BAe-125-800	Light transport ac	1995	1998-2007	(20)	'H-X' programme; RH-800 or Hawker-800 version; modified in Japan for SAR; Japanese designation U-125A
	(80)	S-70/UH-60L Blackhawk	Helicopter	1995	1998-2007	(27)	\$2.7 b deal; UH-60JA version
	18	LM-500	Gas turbine (SH)	(1999)	2002-2004	18	For 6 Hayabusa FAC produced in Japan; LM-500-G-07 version
	(13)	AH-64D Apache	Combat helicopter	2001	2006-2007	(6)	'AH-X' programme; AH-64DJP version

	2	Mk-45-4 127mm	Naval gun	2003	2007	1	For 2 Improved Kongou/Atagou destroyers produced in Japan
	9	RIM-66/SM-3	SAM	(2006)	2007	(3)	Part of \$6.5-9.3 b anti-ballistic missile defence system (incl production of components in Japan); SM-3 Block-1 version; for Kongou destroyers
<hr/>							
Kazakhstan							
S: USA	6	Bell-205/UH-1 Huey-2	Helicopter	(2003)	2004	(6)	Ex-US UH-1H rebuilt to Huey-2; aid against terrorists
	2	Bell-205/UH-1 Huey-2	Helicopter	2007	2007	(2)	Option on 6 more
	(40)	M-1114 ECV	APC/ISV	2007			M-1151 version; delivery 2008-2009
<hr/>							
Malaysia							
S: USA	12	T-800	Turboshaft	1999	2003-2004	12	For 12 Super Lynx-300 helicopters from UK
	211	6V-53	Diesel engine (AV)	2000	2002-2004	(211)	For 211 AIFV (ACV-300) IFV/APC from Turkey; 6V-53T version
	12	Caterpillar-3616	Diesel engine (SH)	2000	2006	4	For 6 MEKO-A100 (Kedah) frigates from FRG
	31	Sharpshooter	IFV turret	2000	2002-2003	(31)	For 31 AIFV (ACV-300) IFV from Turkey
	6	RDR-1500	MP aircraft radar	(2001)	2003-2004	(6)	For 6 AS-555SN helicopters from France
	..	CT-7	Turboprop	2002	2005-2006	(4)	For 2 CN-235 transport aircraft from Indonesia; CT-7-9C3 version
	20	AIM-120C AMRAAM	BVRAAM	(2005)	2007	(20)	AIM-120C-5 version
	2	RGM-84 Harpoon	Anti-ship missile	(2005)	2006	2	AGM-84A version
<hr/>							
Pakistan							
S: USA	(250)	6V-53	Diesel engine (AV)	(2000)	2005-2006	(250)	For Talha APC and Al Qaswa ALV produced in Pakistan
	5	Bell-205/UH-1 Huey-2	Helicopter	(2001)	2002	5	Ex-US UH-1H rebuilt to Huey-2; part of \$73 m US aid for Afghan border patrol
	6	CT-7	Turboprop	2002	2004	(6)	For 3 CN-235 transport aircraft from Indonesia; CT-7-9C3 version
	(6)	L-88 LASS	Air surv radar	(2003)			\$155 m deal; for surveillance of border area with Afghanistan; status uncertain
	19	T-37B	Trainer aircraft	2003	2004	(19)	Ex-US; aid
	(20)	Bell-209/AH-1F	Combat helicopter	2004	2007	(20)	Ex-US; modernized before delivery; 20 more for spares only
	26	Bell-412	Helicopter	2004	2004-2005	26	Originally \$230 m deal for 2 year lease but given to Pakistan in 2007; from Canadian production line; for use in 'war on terrorism'; incl some for police; Bell-412EP version

(2014)	BGM-71 TOW	Anti-tank missile	(2004)	2006-2007	(1500)	\$82 m deal; TOW-2A version; for AH-1 combat helicopters
6	C-130E Hercules	Transport aircraft	2004	2005-2007	(6)	Ex-Australian aircraft sold back to US producer and sold to Pakistan; \$64 m deal; modernized before delivery; 1 more for spares only
300	AIM-9L/M Sidewinder	SRAAM	2005	2007	300	\$29 m deal; AIM-9M1/2 version
6	AN/TPS-77	Air surv radar	2005			\$89 m deal; delivery by 2009
2	F-16A	FGA aircraft	2005	2005	2	Ex-US (but only used 2 years); originally produced for Pakistan but delivery embargoed and delivered to USA; aid
115	M-109A5 155mm	Self-propelled gun	(2005)			Ex-US; \$56 m deal; status uncertain
8	P-3CUP Orion	ASW/MP aircraft	2005	2007	2	Ex-US P-3C version rebuilt to P-3CUP in USA (paid with US aid worth up to \$970 m); delivery 2007-2009/2010
60	RGM-84L Harpoon-2	Anti-ship missile	2005	2006	(60)	\$61 m deal; incl 40 AGM-84 version
2	SA-316B Alouette-3	Light helicopter	2005	2006	2	Second-hand; SA-319B version
(24)	F-16C	FGA aircraft	(2006)	2007	(6)	Ex-US F-16A modernized to F-16AM before delivery; aid
18	F-16C Block-50/52	FGA aircraft	2006			\$1.5 b deal (part of \$5 b deal); incl 6 F-16D; option on 18 more
500	JDAM	Guided bomb	(2006)			
6	Mk-15 Phalanx	CIWS	2006			Part of \$155 m deal (incl modernization of 6 Pakistani Phalanx)
3	P-3 AEW Orion	AEW&C aircraft	(2006)			\$855 m deal; contract not yet signed
(1600)	Paveway	Guided bomb	(2006)			
2	TF-50	Gas turbine (SH)	2006	2007	1	For MRTP-33 FAC delivered by Turkey
(18)	AAQ-33 Sniper	Aircraft El/Op system	2007			For F-16 combat aircraft
500	AIM-120C AMRAAM	BVRAAM	2007			\$265 m deal; AIM-120C-5 version; for F-16 combat aircraft; delivery 2008-2011
200	AIM-9L/M Sidewinder	SRAAM	2007			AIM-9M8 and AIM-9M9 version; for F-16 combat aircraft
34	AN/APG-68	Aircraft radar	2007			AN/APG-68(V)9 version; for 'Mid-Life Update' (MLU) modernization of 34 F-16A combat aircraft to F-16AM (F-16C) version; delivery from 2008
3198	BGM-71 TOW	Anti-tank missile	(2007)			\$185 m deal; incl 2769 TOW-2A and 415 TOW-2RF; contract not yet signed
(10)	RGM-84L Harpoon-2	Anti-ship missile	(2007)			

Philippines

S: USA

8	Bell-205/UH-1H	Helicopter	2001	2002-2003	8	Ex-US; aid
1	C-130B Hercules	Transport aircraft	(2001)	2001	1	Ex-US; aid
1	Cyclone	Patrol craft	(2001)	2004	1	Ex-US; aid; Philippine designation Alvares
(1)	6V-53	Diesel engine (AV)	(2002)	2004	(1)	For 1 AIFV ARV from Turkey
4	C-130H Hercules	Transport aircraft	(2002)			Ex-UK C-130K version sold back to US producer; \$41 m deal; modernized before delivery; incl for MP
20	Bell-205/UH-1H	Helicopter	2003	2007	(20)	Ex-US; part of \$30 m aid (incl 10 more for spares)
(7)	Bell-205/UH-1H	Helicopter	2003	2004-2005	(7)	Second-hand; part of \$12 m deal; ordered and delivered via Singapore; modernized in Singapore before delivery
(6)	Bell-205/UH-1H	Helicopter	2003	2006-2007	(6)	Ex-US; \$8.2 m deal; modernized before delivery
48	M-113	APC	(2003)	2006	(48)	Ex-US; aid

L:

2	Bell-205/UH-1 Huey-2	Helicopter	1997	2005	(2)	Philippine UH-1H rebuilt to Huey-2; assembled from kits in Philippines
---	----------------------	------------	------	------	-----	--

Singapore

S: USA

(500)	6V-92	Diesel engine (AV)	(1995)	1997-2004	(500)	For Bionix IFV produced in Singapore
6	CH-47D Chinook	Helicopter	1998	2000-2001	(6)	CH-47SD version
8	AH-64D Apache	Combat helicopter	1999	2002	(8)	Part of 'Peace Vanguard' deal worth \$620 m (incl \$26 m for Longbow radars); stationed in USA until 2006
(20)	AIM-7M Sparrow	BVRAAM	(2000)	2001	20	
(60)	AIM-9L/M Sidewinder	SRAAM	(2000)	2001	60	AIM-9S version
20	F-16C Block-50/52	FGA aircraft	(2000)	2004-2005	(20)	'Peace Carvin-4' deal; F-16D Block-52+ version
2	S-70/UH-60L Blackhawk	Helicopter	2000	2002	(2)	
(192)	AGM-114K HELLFIRE	Anti-tank missile	(2001)	2005	(192)	For AH-64D helicopters
12	AH-64D Apache	Combat helicopter	2001	2005	(12)	\$617 m 'Peace Vanguard' deal; stationed in USA until 2006
100	AIM-120C AMRAAM	BVRAAM	2001	2002-2003	(100)	\$85-100 m deal; for F-16 and possibly F-5S combat aircraft; stored in USA until 2003 when delivered to Singapore after China and Viet Nam introduced similar AA-12 missiles in 2002/2003
18	AN/AAQ-14 LANTIRN	Aircraft radar	2001	2004-2005	(18)	For F-16 combat aircraft
54	M-109 chassis	Gun chassis	(2001)	2001-2005	(54)	For use as chassis of Primus self-propelled gun produced in Singapore (with Singaporean 155mm gun turret)
50	AIM-120C AMRAAM	BVRAAM	2004	2006	(50)	\$25 m deal; AIM-120C-5 version
(60)	AGM-154 JSOW	ASM	(2005)			For F-15SG combat aircraft; status uncertain

	12	F-15E Strike Eagle	Fighter/bomber ac	2005			\$1 b 'NFRP' programme; F-15SG version; delivery 2008-2009
	6	S-70B/SH-60B Seahawk	ASW helicopter	2005			SH-70(N) version; delivery 2008-2010
	(100)	AIM-120C AMRAAM	BVRAAM	(2006)			For F-15SG combat aircraft; AIM-120C-5 version
	(200)	AIM-9X Sidewinder	SRAAM	(2006)			For F-15SG combat aircraft
	50	JDAM	Guided bomb	(2006)			
	12	F-15E Strike Eagle	Fighter/bomber ac	2007			F-15SG version; delivery from 2010
	4	Gulfstream-5	Transport aircraft	2007			G-550 version; for modification to AEW aircraft; delivery 2008-2010
	84	Paveway	Guided bomb	(2007)			Incl 28 GBU-10 and 56 GBU-12 version
<hr/>							
South Korea S: USA	(75)	RGM-84 Harpoon	Anti-ship missile	(1994)	1998-2004	(75)	UGM-84 version; for Type-209 (Chang Bogo) submarines
	(150)	Mk-46 Mod-5 NEARTIP	ASW torpedo	(1995)	1998-2005	(150)	For KDX-1 (Kwanggaeto the Great) frigates and for ASROC ASW missiles on KDX-2 frigates
	8	RH-800XP	Reconnaissance ac	1996	2000-2001	(8)	'Paekdu/Peace Pioneer' deal worth \$461 m; incl 4 RH-800RA ground-surveillance and RH-800SIG SIGINT version; deal temporarily suspended in 1998 after corruption charges
	13	AN/AQS-18	Dipping sonar	1997	1999-2001	(13)	For 13 Super Lynx helicopters from UK
	16	CT-7	Turboprop	1997	2001-2002	16	For 8 CN-235 transport aircraft from Indonesia; CT-7-9C3 version
	100	Popeye-1	ASM	(1997)	2002	(100)	Deal worth \$125 m incl modernization of 30 F-4E combat aircraft; US designation AGM-142
	3	AN/SPS-49	Air surv radar	(1999)	2003-2005	3	For 3 KDX-2 frigates produced in South Korea; AN/SPS-49(V)5 version
	6	LM-2500	Gas turbine (SH)	(1999)	2003-2005	6	For 3 KDX-2 frigates produced in South Korea
	(627)	BGM-71 TOW	Anti-tank missile	2000	2001	(627)	Probably BGM-71E TOW-2A version
	110	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	2000	2003-2005	(110)	\$159 m deal; for KDX-2 frigates; SM-2MR Block-3A version
	(4)	Shadow-400	UAV	2000	2001-2002	(4)	
	111	MGM-140A1 ATACMS	SSM	2001	2004	(111)	Deal worth \$81 m
	(18)	RGM-84 Harpoon	Anti-ship missile	(2001)	2003	(18)	
	64	RIM-116A RAM	SAM	2001	2004-2005	(64)	For KDX-2 frigates
	(3)	AGM-65G Maverick	ASM	(2002)	2003	(3)	Version uncertain
	147	AIM-120C AMRAAM	BVRAAM	2002	2005-2006	(147)	Part of deal worth \$110 m; for F-15K combat aircraft
	3	AN/SPY-1D	Air surv radar	(2002)			For 3 KDX-3 destroyers produced in South Korea
	29	M-270 MLRS 227mm	MRL	2002	2002-2004	(29)	\$498 m deal

	(40)	Tiger Eyes	Aircraft El/Op system	2002	2005-2007	(20)	\$164 m deal; for F-15K combat aircraft
	(45)	AGM-84H SLAM-ER	ASM	(2003)	2006-2007	(36)	\$70 m deal; for F-15K combat aircraft
	27	F-404	Turbofan	(2003)	2006-2007	(22)	\$80 m deal; for 25 T-50 trainer aircraft produced in South Korea; F-404-GE-102 version
	(14)	JDAM	Guided bomb	2003	2006	(14)	
	105	AIM-9X Sidewinder	SRAAM	2004	2006-2007	(105)	Part of \$110 m deal; for F-15K combat aircraft
	(125)	RIM-116A RAM	SAM	(2004)	2007	(30)	For KDX-3 destroyers and Dodko (LPX) AALS
	8	P-3CUP Orion	ASW/MP aircraft	2005	2007	(2)	Ex-US; P-3B version rebuilt to P-3CUP in USA; \$493 m deal (\$66 m for aircraft and \$427 m for modernization); 1 more for spares only; delivery 2007-2009
	47	F-404	Turbofan	(2006)			For 47 T-50 trainer and T-50 LIFT (TA-50) combat/trainer aircraft produced South Korea; delivery from 2008
	26	RGM-84L Harpoon-2	Anti-ship missile	2006			\$38 m deal; incl 20 AGM-84 and 6 UGM-84 version
	(30)	RIM-116A RAM	SAM	2006	2007	30	\$17.4 m deal; RIM-116A Block-1/HAS version
	48	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	(2006)			\$111 m deal; SM-2 Block-3B version; for KDX destroyers
	(490)	T-700	Turboshaft	2006			For 245 KHP helicopters produced in South Korea
	102	AIM-9X Sidewinder	SRAAM	(2007)			Part of \$55 m deal; for F-15K combat aircraft
	210	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	(2007)			Contract possibly not yet signed
	..	RIM-66/SM-3	SAM	(2007)			For KDX-3 destroyers; contract not yet signed
L:	12	F-100	Turbofan	1991	1998-2001	(12)	54% value produced in South Korean; spares for F-16 combat aircraft
	120	F-16C Block-50/52	FGA aircraft	1991	1994-2001	(120)	\$2.5 b 'Peace Bridge-2' or 'Korean Fighter Programme' (KFP) deal (incl production of components for all 120 and 36 assembled from kits and 72 produced in South Korea; up to 51% value produced in South Korean); F-16 Block-52 version; incl some F-16D; South Korean designation KF-16
	200	K-1A1/Type-88	Tank	(1994)	2004-2007	(100)	KRW1 tr (\$781 m) deal; incl 2 or 3 prototypes
	57	LVTP-7A1/AAV-7A1	APC	1995	1997-2001	(57)	\$91 m deal; incl 5 ARV and 4 CP version; South Korean designation KAAV (Korean Armoured Amphibious Vehicle)
	3	Mk-45 127mm	Naval gun	1999	2003-2005	3	\$22 m deal; for 3 KDX-2 frigates produced in South Korea; Mk-45 Mod-4 version
	4	AN/TPS-77	Air surv radar	2000	2002	(4)	\$54 m deal (offsets incl production of components in South Korea)

	20	F-16C Block-50/52	FGA aircraft	2000	2003-2004	(20)	\$663 m 'Korean Fighter Programme-2' (KFP-2) deal (78% value produced in South Korea); F-16 Block-52 version; incl 5 F-16D; for use as reconnaissance aircraft; South Korean designation KF-16
	67	LVTP-7A1/AAV-7A1	APC	2000	2001-2006	(67)	\$99-120 m deal; South Korean designation KAAV (Korean Armoured Amphibious Vehicle)
	3	AN/TPS-77	Air surv radar	2002	2004	(3)	\$39 m deal (offsets incl production of components in South Korea)
	40	F-15E Strike Eagle	Fighter/bomber ac	2002	2005-2007	(30)	\$4.2 b 'F-X' programme (offsets 65-83% incl production of components for 32 F-15K and all production of AH-64 combat helicopter fuselages in South Korea); F-15K Slam Eagle version; option on 40 more; delivery 2005-2008
	4	Boeing-737-7ES	AEW&C aircraft	2006			\$1.7 b 'E-X' programme (incl 3 partly produced in South Korea); deliver 2011-2012
	20	F-15E Strike Eagle	Fighter/bomber ac	(2006)			Contract not yet signed; delivery 2009-2010
	(100)	LVTP-7/AAV-7	APC	2006	2006-2007	(23)	KRW149 b (\$157 m) deal; delivery 2006-2010
<hr/>							
Sri Lanka							
S: USA	2	AN/TPQ-36 Firefinder	Arty locating radar	(2000)	2003-2004	(2)	\$22 m deal
	1	Beech-200 HISAR	AGS aircraft	2000	2002	1	For use against LTTE rebels
	1	Reliance	OPV	2004	2004	1	Ex-US; aid; modernized (for \$6.9 m) before delivery
	(1)	Sea surv. radar	Sea surv radar	(2005)	2007	(1)	Aid against LTTE rebels
<hr/>							
Taiwan							
S: USA	(383)	RIM-66B Standard-1MR	SAM	(1994)	1994-2001	(383)	For Perry (Cheng Kung) frigates
	300	M-60A3 Patton-2	Tank	1996	1998-2002	(300)	Ex-US; deal worth \$223 m
	(21)	Bell-209/AH-1W	Combat helicopter	1997	2000-2002	(21)	\$479 m deal
	1786	BGM-71 TOW	Anti-tank missile	1997	1999-2001	(1786)	Deal worth \$80 m incl 114 launchers; BGM-71E TOW-2A version
	1299	FIM-92 Stinger	Portable SAM	1997	1999-2001	(1299)	\$420 m deal (incl 74 Avenger SAM systems)
	11	S-70B/SH-60B Seahawk	ASW helicopter	1997	2000-2001	(11)	S-70C(M)-2 Thunderhawk version
	(14)	AN/AAQ-13 LANTIRN	Aircraft El/Op system	1998	2000-2001	(14)	Part of deal worth \$106 m; Sharpshooter version; for F-16 combat aircraft
	(14)	AN/AAQ-14 LANTIRN	Aircraft radar	1998	2000-2001	(14)	Part of deal worth \$106 m; Pathfinder version; for F-16 combat aircraft
	728	FIM-92 Stinger	Portable SAM	1998	2000-2001	(728)	\$180 m deal (incl 61 launchers)
	240	AGM-114K HELLFIRE	Anti-tank missile	1999	2001	(240)	\$23 m deal; AGM-114K3 version
	9	CH-47D Chinook	Helicopter	1999	2002-2003	(9)	Deal worth \$300-486 m; CH-47SD version

	2	E-2C Hawkeye-2000	AEW&C aircraft	1999	2005	2	\$400 m deal; E-2T/Hawkeye-2000 version
	120	AIM-120C AMRAAM	BVRAAM	2000	2001-2003	(120)	Deal worth \$150 m; for F-16 combat aircraft; stored in USA until 2003 when delivered to Taiwan after China introduced similar AA-12 missiles in 2002/2003
	302	MIM-72C Chaparral	SAM	2000	2000-2005	(302)	Ex-US; MIM-72E/G/J versions
	40	AGM-65G Maverick	ASM	(2001)	2003	(40)	Deal worth \$18 m; for F-16 combat aircraft
	(100)	AGM-88 HARM	Anti-radar missile	(2001)	2002-2004	(100)	
	(71)	RGM-84 Harpoon	Anti-ship missile	2001	2002	71	
	11	AN/TPS-77	Air surv radar	2002	2004-2006	(11)	Incl 4 AN/TPS-117
	290	BGM-71F TOW-2B	Anti-tank missile	2002	2003-2004	(290)	\$18 m deal
	360	Javelin	Anti-tank missile	(2002)	2005	(360)	\$51 m deal (incl 40 launchers)
	182	AIM-9L/M Sidewinder	SRAAM	2003	2005-2006	(182)	\$17 m deal; AIM-9M-2 version
	4	Kidd	Destroyer	(2003)	2005-2006	4	Ex-US; \$740 m deal; Taiwanese designation Keelung
	54	LVTP-7A1/AAV-7A1	APC	2003	2005	(54)	\$64-156 m deal; ex-US AAV-7A1 rebuilt to AAV-7A1RAM/RS; incl 4 CP and 2 ARV version
	(22)	RGM-84L Harpoon-2	Anti-ship missile	(2003)	2005-2006	(22)	RGM-84L Block-2 version; for Kidd (Keelung) destroyers
	(148)	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	(2003)	2005-2006	(148)	SM-2 Block-3A version; for Kidd (Keelung) destroyers
	(449)	AGM-114K HELLFIRE	Anti-tank missile	(2004)			Part of \$50 m deal; AGM-114M3 version
	5	AIM-7M Sparrow	BVRAAM	2005	2007	(5)	Part of \$280 m deal; for training in USA
	10	AIM-9L/M Sidewinder	SRAAM	2005	2006	(10)	Part of \$280 m deal; AIM-9M version; for training in USA
	1	AN/BOND	Air surv radar	2005			Part of \$752 m deal; delivery by 2009
	(1400)	C-9	Diesel engine (AV)	(2005)	2007	(20)	For 1400 CM-32 APC/IFV produced in Taiwan
	3	S-92/H-92 Superhawk	Helicopter	(2006)			For SAR; contract not yet signed
	235	AGM-65G Maverick	ASM	(2007)			Contract possibly not yet signed
	(30)	AH-64D Apache	Combat helicopter	(2007)			Contract not yet signed
	218	AIM-120C AMRAAM	BVRAAM	(2007)			Contract possibly not yet signed
	..	MIM-104 PAC-3	SAM	(2007)			Contract not yet signed
	(12)	P-3CUP Orion	ASW/MP aircraft	(2007)			Ex-US P-3 rebuilt to P-3CUP (incl 8-10 in Taiwan); contract not yet signed
	144	RIM-66M Standard-2	SAM	(2007)			Contract not yet signed
L:	8	Perry/FFG-7	Frigate	1989	1993-2004	8	'Kwang Hua-1' project; order for last 1 delayed from 1997 to 2001 for financial reasons; Taiwanese designation Cheng Kung
	13	Bell-206/OH-58D(I)	Combat helicopter	1999	1999-2001	(13)	\$172 m deal; assembled from kits in Taiwan

Thailand
S: USA

6	M-88A2 HERCULES	ARV	(1998)	2000-2001	(6)	
16	F-16A	FGA aircraft	2000	2002-2003	(16)	Ex-US; \$130-157 m 'Peace Naresuan-4' deal; modernized before delivery; incl 1 F-16B; incl 2 more for spares only
8	AIM-120C AMRAAM	BVRAAM	(2001)	2003	(8)	\$6.1 m deal; for F-16 combat aircraft; acquired as reaction to Myanmar order for MiG-29 combat aircraft; stored in USA until 2003 when delivered to Thailand after China and Viet Nam introduced similar AA-12 missiles in 2002/2003
30	Bell-205/UH-1 Huey-2	Helicopter	2001	2002-2004	(30)	Ex-US UH-1H rebuilt to Huey-2; aid
3	S-70/UH-60L Blackhawk	Helicopter	2001	2001-2002	(3)	\$30-36 m deal; for patrol and anti-narcotics operations along border with Myanmar
4	T-800	Turboshaft	2001	2004	4	For 2 Super Lynx-300 helicopters from UK
(4)	S-70/UH-60L Blackhawk	Helicopter	2003	2004-2005	4	THB3 b deal
7	Bell-209/AH-1F	Combat helicopter	(2005)			Ex-US; aid (Thailand to pay THB300 m (\$7.1 m) for overhaul and transport)
3	SeaVue	MP aircraft radar	(2005)	2006	(1)	For modernization of 3 P-3T ASW/MP aircraft
1	AN/TPS-77	Air surv radar	2007			
6	F-404	Turbofan	(2007)			For 6 JAS-39 Gripen combat aircraft from Sweden
2	S-70B/SH-60B Seahawk	ASW helicopter	2007			MH-60S version; \$58 m deal; delivery 2009

B. PRC ARMS TRANSFERS

Transfers of major conventional weapons: sorted by recipient. Deals with deliveries or orders made for year range 2001 to 2007

Note: The 'No. delivered/produced' and the 'Year(s) of deliveries' columns refer to all deliveries since the beginning of the contract. Deals in which the recipient was involved in the production of the weapon system are listed separately. The 'Comments' column includes publicly reported information on the value of the deal. Information on the sources and methods used in the collection of the data, and explanations of the conventions, abbreviations and acronyms, can be found at URL <<http://armstrade.sipri.org/>>. The SIPRI Arms Transfers Database is continuously updated as new information becomes available.

Source: SIPRI Arms Transfers Database

Information generated: 15 November 2008

Recipient/ supplier (S) or licensor (L)	No. ordered	Weapon designation	Weapon description	Year of order/ licence	Year(s) of deliveries	No. delivered/ produced	Comments
Bangladesh							
S: China	(21)	HN-5A	Portable SAM	(2000)	2001	21	HN-5JA1 version
	(114)	Red Arrow-8	Anti-tank missile	(2000)	2001	114	
	20	Type-83 122mm	Towed gun	(2003)	2004	20	
	1	Crotale	SAM system	(2004)	2007	(1)	FM-90 version; for DW-2000 frigate
	(69)	PL-7	SRAAM	(2004)	2005-2006	69	For F-7MG combat aircraft
	..	QW-2	Portable SAM	2004	2006-2007	(100)	
	..	C-801/C-802 CDS	Coast defence system	(2005)			Status uncertain
	(65)	D-30 122mm	Towed gun	(2005)	2006	(65)	Type-96 version
	..	PL-9	SRAAM	(2005)	2006	10	For F-7MG combat aircraft
	(20)	R-440 Crotale	SAM	(2005)	2007	(20)	FM-90 version; for DW-2000 frigate
	16	F-7MG	Fighter aircraft	(2006)	2006	16	\$44-118 m deal; F-7BG version
Cambodia							
S: China	(6)	Type-062/Shanghai	Patrol craft	2005	2005	(6)	Designation uncertain; ex-Chinese; aid
	(9)	Type-062/Shanghai	Patrol craft	(2007)	2007	(9)	Shanghai-2 version

Indonesia							
S: China	3	C-802/CSS-N-8/Saccade	Anti-ship missile	2005	2006	3	Part of \$11.2 deal; for FAC
Myanmar (Burma)							
S: China	(5)	Rice Lamp	Fire control radar	(1991)	2002-2003	(5)	For 5 Myanmar patrol craft produced in Myanmar
	(5)	Type-76 37mm	Naval gun turret	(1991)	1998-2002	(5)	For 5 Myanmar patrol craft produced in Myanmar
	(3)	Type-344	Fire control radar	(1996)	2004-2005	(3)	For 3 Myanmar FAC produced in Myanmar
	(25)	C-801/CSS-N-4/Sardine	Anti-ship missile	(2001)	2004-2005	(24)	For Myanmar FAC produced in Myanmar
L:	(3)	Sinmalaik	Corvette	(1997)	2001-2003	(3)	
Nepal							
S: China	(5)	WZ-551	APC	2005	2005	(5)	
	1	MA-60	Transport aircraft	2007			
Sri Lanka							
S: China	6	K-8 Karakorum-8	Trainer/combat ac	(2000)	2001	6	
	(3)	CEIEC-408C	Air surv radar	2004	2004-2006	(3)	Designation uncertain; incl for civilian air traffic control
	3	K-8 Karakorum-8	Trainer/combat ac	(2004)	2005	3	
	1	JY-11	Air surv radar	(2007)			
Thailand							
S: China	2	Pattani	Frigate	2002	2005-2006	2	EUR75-80 m (\$66-95 m) deal
	(50)	C-802/CSS-N-8/Saccade	Anti-ship missile	(2007)			Contract not yet signed

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX B. TSCMIS DATA

Country	Event Type	2007 Events	2006 Events	2005 Events
Bangladesh	Strategic-Level	17 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	17 Conf, 7 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	18 Conf, 5 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	1 HLV, 10 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 7 Exercises/Trng	1 HLV, 9 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	21 Education/PME	18 Education/PME	16 Education/PME
Bhutan	NTSC	2	1	0
	Strategic-Level	0 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	1 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	3 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng
Brunei	PME Exchanges	2 Education/PME	3 Education/PME	3 Education/PME
	NTSC	0	0	0
	Strategic-Level	23 Conf, 6 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	12 Conf, 18 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	13 Conf, 7 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
Burma	Regional	1 HLV, 10 Exercises/Trng	1 HLV, 6 Exercises/Trng	1 HLV, 4 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	16 Education/PME	5 Education/PME	8 Education/PME
	NTSC	0	0	0
Cambodia	Strategic-Level	0 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	2 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	1 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 1 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	0 Education/PME	0 Education/PME	0 Education/PME
India	NTSC	0	0	1
	Strategic-Level	12 Conf, 8 Mil-Mil, 24 FMS	18 Conf, 16 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	9 Conf, 5 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	1 HLV, 13 Exercises/Trng	3 HLV, 7 Exercises/Trng	1 HLV, 4 Exercises/Trng
Indonesia	PME Exchanges	28 Education/PME	31 Education/PME	21 Education/PME
	NTSC	10	16	13
	Strategic-Level	35 Conf, 13 Mil-Mil, 2 FMS	36 Conf, 18 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	37 Conf, 34 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
Japan	Regional	8 HLV, 20 Exercises/Trng	9 HLV, 9 Exercises/Trng	6 HLV, 13 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	29 Education/PME	20 Education/PME	17 Education/PME
	NTSC	0	0	3
Laos	Strategic-Level	36 Conf, 13 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	30 Conf, 13 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	27 Conf, 21 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	9 HLV, 30 Exercises/Trng	12 HLV, 24 Exercises/Trng	8 HLV, 12 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	31 Education/PME	18 Education/PME	18 Education/PME
Laos	NTSC	11	12	10
	Strategic-Level	63 Conf, 45 Mil-Mil, 5 FMS	73 Conf, 93 Mil-Mil, 5 FMS	70 Conf, 117 Mil-Mil, 3 FMS
	Regional	21 HLV, 33 Exercises/Trng	7 HLV, 43 Exercises/Trng	12 HLV, 42 Exercises/Trng
Laos	PME Exchanges	24 Education/PME	15 Education/PME	19 Education/PME
	NTSC	2	0	2
	Strategic-Level	4 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	2 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	4 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
Laos	Regional	0 HLV, 1 Exercises/Trng	1 HLV, 1 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	9 Education/PME	3 Education/PME	1 Education/PME
	NTSC	9	7	9

Country	Event Type	2007 Events	2006 Events	2005 Events
Malaysia	Strategic-Level	41 Conf, 15 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	31 Conf, 27 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	37 Conf, 14 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	4 HLV, 26 Exercises/Trng	2 HLV, 19 Exercises/Trng	3 HLV, 23 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	30 Education/PME	19 Education/PME	19 Education/PME
Mongolia	NTSC	2	1	1
	Strategic-Level	25 Conf, 7 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	23 Conf, 13 Mil-Mil, 1 FMS	24 Conf, 7 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	3 HLV, 11 Exercises/Trng	6 HLV, 4 Exercises/Trng	2 HLV, 5 Exercises/Trng
Nepal	PME Exchanges	21 Education/PME	15 Education/PME	17 Education/PME
	NTSC	3	3	2
	Strategic-Level	15 Conf, 4 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	11 Conf, 5 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	11 Conf, 3 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
North Korea	Regional	1 HLV, 13 Exercises/Trng	1 HLV, 3 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 3 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	24 Education/PME	19 Education/PME	18 Education/PME
	NTSC	0	1	0
Philippines	Strategic-Level	0 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	0 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	1 Conf, 1 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	0 Education/PME	0 Education/PME	0 Education/PME
Russia	NTSC	0	0	1
	Strategic-Level	42 Conf, 93 Mil-Mil, 7 FMS	36 Conf, 37 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	35 Conf, 26 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	7 HLV, 32 Exercises/Trng	4 HLV, 32 Exercises/Trng	4 HLV, 23 Exercises/Trng
Singapore	PME Exchanges	25 Education/PME	20 Education/PME	23 Education/PME
	NTSC	5	18	19
	Strategic-Level	7 Conf, 3 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	13 Conf, 5 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	20 Conf, 3 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
South Korea	Regional	2 HLV, 5 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 3 Exercises/Trng	0 HLV, 5 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	3 Education/PME	4 Education/PME	4 Education/PME
	NTSC	0	1	2
Sri Lanka	Strategic-Level	41 Conf, 16 Mil-Mil, 2 FMS	36 Conf, 95 Mil-Mil, 7 FMS	35 Conf, 102 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
	Regional	6 HLV, 26 Exercises/Trng	5 HLV, 24 Exercises/Trng	13 HLV, 12 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	30 Education/PME	14 Education/PME	17 Education/PME
Sri Lanka	NTSC	0	0	2
	Strategic-Level	40 Conf, 113 Mil-Mil, 6 FMS	40 Conf, 92 Mil-Mil, 3 FMS	47 Conf, 122 Mil-Mil, 3 FMS
	Regional	10 HLV, 34 Exercises/Trng	10 HLV, 51 Exercises/Trng	6 HLV, 45 Exercises/Trng
Sri Lanka	PME Exchanges	24 Education/PME	14 Education/PME	19 Education/PME
	NTSC	6	3	2
	Strategic-Level	18 Conf, 3 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	14 Conf, 5 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS	22 Conf, 6 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS
Sri Lanka	Regional	1 HLV, 8 Exercises/Trng	1 HLV, 8 Exercises/Trng	3 HLV, 6 Exercises/Trng
	PME Exchanges	22 Education/PME	13 Education/PME	16 Education/PME
	NTSC	0	0	5

Country	Event Type	2007 Events	2006 Events	2005 Events
Taiwan	Strategic-Level Regional PME Exchanges NTSC	8 Conf, 11 Mil-Mil, 2 FMS 7 HLV, 1 Exercises/Trng 10 Education/PME 0	12 Conf, 21 Mil-Mil, 1 FMS 1 HLV, 2 Exercises/Trng 6 Education/PME 0	2 Conf, 21 Mil-Mil, 1 FMS 6 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng 14 Education/PME 0
Thailand	Strategic-Level Regional PME Exchanges NTSC	40 Conf, 17 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS 4 HLV, 27 Exercises/Trng 32 Education/PME 3	34 Conf, 58 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS 8 HLV, 25 Exercises/Trng 16 Education/PME 5	36 Conf, 35 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS 4 HLV, 27 Exercises/Trng 21 Education/PME 3
Timor-Leste	Strategic-Level Regional PME Exchanges NTSC	5 Conf, 0 Mil-Mil, 5 FMS 0 HLV, 0 Exercises/Trng 7 Education/PME 0	6 Conf, 2 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS 0 HLV, 1 Exercises/Trng 6 Education/PME 0	6 Conf, 3 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS 1 HLV, Exercises/Trng 6 Education/PME 0
Viet Nam	Strategic-Level Regional PME Exchanges NTSC	16 Conf, 5 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS 3 HLV, 5 Exercises/Trng 23 Education/PME 12	17 Conf, 4 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS 2 HLV, 1 Exercises/Trng 27 Education/PME 9	9 Conf, 15 Mil-Mil, 0 FMS 0 HLV, 2 Exercises/Trng 14 Education/PME 11

Year	Total Activities
2003	780
2004	1077
2005	1279
2006	1344
2007	1149

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX C. PLA DIPLOMACY ACTIVITIES

Country	Year	Activity Type	Description
Bangladesh	2005	Regional	On the military front, Genreal Liang Guanglie, Chief of General Staff of the People's Liberation Army, visited Bangladesh. Bangladesh Chief of Naval Staff, Principal Staff Officer of Armed Forces Division of PM Office, and Director General of Directorate Genera of Forces Intelligence visited China.
Bangladesh	2005	Strategic-level activities	In May, China's Chief of General Staff visits Bangladesh. In July, Bangladesh's Chief of Naval Staff visits China.
Bangladesh	2006	Regional	In May, the Chief of Army Staff of Bangladesh visits China
Brunei Darussalam	2004	Regional	Major General Halbi, Commander of the Armed Forces of Brunei, observed the "Iron Fist-2004" Military Exercise during his visit to China. In November, General Qian Guoliang, Commander of the Shenyang Military Region, visited Brunei at the head of a PLA senior military delegation
Brunei Darussalam	2005	Strategic-level activities	In October, Brunei's Deputy Minister of Defense visits China.
Cambodia	2004	Regional	Commander-in-Chief of the Cambodian Royal Armed Forces General Ke Kim Yan and Director General of National Police General Hok Lundy also paid separate visit to China
Cambodia	2005	Regional	Commissioner General of the National Police visited China
Cambodia	####	Regional	A delegation of senior military officers headed by Lt. General Meas Sophea, Deputy Armed Forces, visited China a study mission. A hospital built with Chinese grant was completed and transferred to the Cambodian Royal Armed Forces.
D.P.R.K	2004	Regional	National Defense Commission Chairman Kim Jong Il paid an informal visit to China. General secretary Kim Jong Il also met with Chairman of the CPC Central Military Commission Jiang Zemin
D.P.R.K	2005	Regional	Deputy Chief, General Political Bureau and Peoples' Army made visit to China from April 19 - 23.
D.P.R.K	2005	Regional	On 28-30 October, at the invitation of the General Secretary of the Worker's Party of Korea and Chairman of the National Defense Commission Kim Jong Il, CCCPC General secretary and President of PRC Hu Jintao paid an official good-will visit to the DPRK.
D.P.R.K	2006	Regional	In April, China's Minister of National Defense visits D.P.R.K
D.P.R.K	####	Regional	First Vice Chairman of the D.P.R.K. National Defense Commission Jo Myong Rok visited China and was received by President Hu Jintao.
D.P.R.K	####	Regional	General Xu Caihou, member of the CPCCC Secretariat and the CPC Central Military Commission visited D.P.R.K and was received by Secretary Kim Jong Il

Country	Year	Activity Type	Description
D.P.R.K	May 2000 and January 2001	Regional	WPK General Secretary and National Defense Commission Chairman Kim Jong Il visited China
Timor-Leste	2006	Regional	In February, Minister of Defense from East Timor visited China
India	2003	Cooperation with other nations in non-traditional security areas - counter-terrorism cooperation	Exchanges in the military grew steadily. Held second round of counter-terrorism consultation. Also had official visit in June 2003 to China by Prime Minister Vajpayee and was met by President Hu Jintao, Central Military Commission Chairman Jiang Zemin.
India	2004	Regional	Joint team of diplomatic and military experts held the 14th meeting
India	2004	Professional Military Education Exchanges	Military exchanges and cooperation made steady progress. In March, Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission and Defense Minister General Cao Gangchuan paid a visit to India and the two sides agreed on further strengthening the friendly cooperation between their armed forces. Chinese Academy of Military Science and National Defense University delegations visited India. In December, India's Chief of Army Staff General NC Vij visited China. Indian Air Force and army delegations also visited China. Border troops on the two sides carried out a joint mountain-climbing exercise
India	2005	Strategic-level activities	In March, the 15th Meeting of the China-India Joint Working Group on the Boundary Question and the 15th Meeting of Diplomatic and Military Experts Group were convened in Beijing. In April, the two government signed the Protocol on Modalities for the Implementation of Confidence Building Measures in the Military Field Along the Line of Actual Control in the China-India Border Areas.
India	2005	Regional	Military exchanges and security cooperation grew steadily. In May General Liang Guanglie, Member of the CPC Central Military Commission and Chief of the General Staff of PLA, paid an Official goodwill visit to India. The two countries agreed to enhance bilateral military exchanges and cooperation. In September, both countries signed an MOU for cooperation. In December, a naval fleet of China paid a goodwill visit to the Cochin Port of India. The two navies staged a joint air/sea search and rescue exercise coded "Sino-Indian Friendship 2005" in the Indian Ocean.
India	2006	Regional	In May/June, India's Minister of Defense visits China. In October, China's Commander of PLA Air Force visits India. IN November/December, China's Political Commissar of Chengdu Military Area Command visits India

Country	Year	Activity Type	Description
India	####	Regional	Military exchanges made steady progress. In April, Defense minister George Fernandez visited China, and the two sides pledged the readiness to develop a friendly relationship between China and India. Later, He made two donations of US\$200,000 worth of medicines and equipment on behalf of the Indian Government and its Defense Ministry for China's ongoing fight against SARS. At the end of 2003, an Indian naval fleet made a friendly port call at Shanghai, and later joined the Chinese navy in a search and rescue exercise in the East China Sea off the coast of Shanghai. This was the first joint exercise by the two navies in the non-traditional security field. The strengthened ties between the two militaries was evidenced by the increased number of visits, such as the visits to India by Deputy Chief of General University delegations, and the visit to China's Tibet Autonomous Region by Commander of India's Fourth Army Corps Mohinder Singh.
Indonesia	2003	Professional Military Education Exchanges	Exchanges between the military, police were strengthened. Army's Chief of Staff Gen. Ryamizard Ryacudu and Director of the Armed Forces Strategic Intelligence Agency Maj. Gen. Luthfie visited China on separate occasions.
Indonesia	2004	Regional	Bilateral exchanges in the military...became more active. Chief of Staff of the Indonesian Air Force General Chappy Hakim visited China
Indonesia	2005	Regional	China and Indonesia reached agreement on establishing a defense consultation mechanism and signed the MOU on Research and Development in Defense Technological Cooperation Between the Commission of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense of the People's Republic of China and the Ministry of Cooperation Between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Indonesia.
Indonesia	2006	Regional	In May, China's Assistant Chief of General Staff visits Indonesia and held the first China-Indonesia Defense and Security Consultation. In July, Indonesia's Chief of Army Staff visits China
Japan	2003	Regional	China and Japan conducted fruitful cooperation in safeguarding regional peace and stability and promoting regional economic development
Japan	2004	Professional Military Education Exchanges	Military-to-Military exchange continued to develop. In January and October, General Xiong Guangkai, Deputy Chief of General Staff of the People's Liberation Army of China and Takemasa Moriya, Administrative Vice Minister of Japan Defense Agency held the 4th and 5th China-Japan defense departments security consultations in Beijing and Tokyo. Armed forces of the two countries also conducted a series of exchanges. The countries continued to utilize ARF, 10+3 summit and other multilateral channels to press ahead with their pragmatic cooperation

Country	Year	Activity Type	Description
Japan	2005	Strategic-level activities	On March 24, Deputy Chief of the PLA General Staff General Xiong Guangkai and Japanese Vice Defense Minister Takemasa Moriya held the sixth China-Japan consultation on defense security in Beijing. The two sides had in-depth exchanges of views on regional and international security situations, defense policies, bilateral relations and defense affairs.
Japan	2006	Regional and Strategic	In November/December, China's Assistant Chief of General Staff visits Japan and held the 7th China-Japan Defense and Security Consultation
Japan	####	Professional Military Education Exchanges	Military-to-Military exchanges were resumed in an all-round way. Japan's Defense Agency Chief Shiger Ishiba visited China on September, the first visit of its kind since 1998. and the two sides agreed on further increasing their exchanges. A number of exchange programs were pursued by the two militaries
Kazakhstan	2005	Strategic-level activities	Bilateral exchanges in military and security areas continued to develop. In May, State Councilor and Minister of Public Security Zhou Yongkang visited Kazakhstan at the invitation of its government and the two sides signed the Agreement of Cooperation Between the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan on Jointly Combating Crimes. In June, he attended the Meeting of Secretaries of the SCO Security Meeting in Astana. In September, Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission, State councilor and Defense Minister General Cao Gangchuan visited Kazakhstan upon invitation. In June, Kazakh Interior Minister Zautbek Turisbekov visited China. In July Deputy Minister of Defense Abay Tasblatov visited China at the head of a delegation to observe the China-Russia joint military exercise. In August, Deputy Ministers of Kazakhstan visits China. In September, China's Minister of National Defense visits Kazakhstan.
Kazakhstan	2006	Regional	In April, Kazakhstan's Deputy Minister of Defense visits China
Kyrgyzstan	2003	Regional	Defense Minister Esen Topoev visited China and met with Vice Premier Huang Ju
Kyrgyzstan	2005	Strategic-level activities	Captain Kurmanov of the National Guards paid a visit to China. From March 18-21 and August, Minister of Defense from Kyrgyzstan visits China
Kyrgyzstan	2006	Regional	In March, the Commander of the Border Forces of Kyrgyzstan visits China. In April, Minister of Defense of Kyrgyzstan visits China.
Laos	2003	Regional	June 12-14 at the invitation of President and CCCPC General-Secretary Hu Jintao, President of Laos and Chairman of the Lao People's Revolution Party (LPRP) Khamtay Siphandone paid a state visit to China. President Hu Jintao, Central Military Commission Chairman Jiang Zemin met with him on separate occasions.
Laos	2006	Regional	In October, China's Chief of General Staff visits Laos

Country	Year	Activity Type	Description
Malaysia	2003	Regional	September, General Liang Guanglie, Member of the Central Military Commission and Chief of the General Staff of the People's Liberation Army, visited Malaysia. Cooperation in military deepened
Malaysia	2004	Regional	Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission General Guo Boxiong also had a transit stopover in Malaysia
Malaysia	2005	Strategic-level activities	Minister of Defense Dato'Seri Najib Tun Razak visited China, where he met with Premier Wen Jaibao and Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission and Minister of Defense General Cao Gangchuan. In September both sides signed the Memorandum of Understanding on Defense Cooperation and agreed to launch the defense and security Consultation mechanism as soon as possible. The two sides also held activities commemorating the 600th anniversary of Zheng He's maritime expedition.
Malaysia	2006	Regional	In April, China's Minister of National Defense visits Malaysia. In May, China's Assistant Chief of General Staff visits Malaysia. In May, Malaysia's Commander of the Armed Forces visits China and held the first China-Malaysia Defense Consultation. In June, Malaysia's Commander of the Navy visits China
Mongolia	2005	Regional	In July, Mongolian Minister of Defense visits China
Myanmar	2003	Regional	In August, Vice Senior General Maung Aye, SpDC Vice Chairman and Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the Defense Armed Forces, visited China and called on President Hu Jintao. In November, at the invitation of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries, Brigadier General Aung Thein Lin and Brigadier General Yan Thein, Mayors of Yangkon and Mandalay respectively, visited China
Myanmar	2006	Regional	In October, China's Chief of General Staff visits Myanmar
Nepal	2003	Regional	Secretary of the Ministry of Defense Madan Prasad Aryal and Lt. General Victory SJB Rana, Chief of Staff of Royal Napalese Army, visited China in April and October
Nepal	2005	Regional	In October, Nepal's Chief of General Staff visits China.
Pakistan	2004	Cooperation with other nations in non-traditional security areas - counter-terrorism cooperation	In March, General Cao Gangchuan, Vice Chairman of teh Central Military Commission and also State Councilor and Minister of Defense, paid a visit to Pakistan. In May, Admiral Shahid Karimullah, Chief of General Staff of th Pakistani Navy, paid a visit to China. In August, armed forces of the two countries conducted a joint counter-terrorist exercise code named "Friendship-2004".
Pakistan	2005	Regional	January 10-14: Minister of Defense of Pakistan visits China
Pakistan	2005	Cooperation with other nations in non-traditional security areas - counter-terrorism cooperation	The two countries signed the Agreement on Cooperation in Combating Terrorism, Secessionism and Extremism.
Pakistan	2005	Strategic-level activities	In April 4 - 11, China-Pakistan held the 3rd Defense Security Consultation

Country	Year	Activity Type	Description
Pakistan	2005	Regional	Two countries maintained friendly military-to-military cooperation and exchanges. In September, Gen. Ehsan Ul Haq, Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee of Pakistan, headed a delegation to visit China. In November, a Chinese naval craft formation visited Pakistan and joined, for the first time, the Pakistani navy in a military exercise in non-traditional security in the Arab Sea, with its main part being joint search and rescue operations.
Pakistan	2006	Regional and Strategic	In May, Pakistan's Chief of Army Staff visits China. In August, China's Assistant Chief of General Staff visits Pakistan and held the 4th China-Pakistan Defense and Security Consultation in Islamabad. In October, China's Commander of PLA Air Force visits Pakistan. In December, China and Pakistan held a joint Counter Terrorism Military Exercise at Abbottabad, Pakistan
Philippines	2003	Regional	In December, a Chinese military delegation led by General Chen Bingde, Commander of the Jinan Military Area Command, visited Philippines
Philippines	2004	Regional	Philippines' National Defense Minister Avelino J Cruz JR. And Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces General Narciso Abaa visited China respectively in November and September
Philippines	2005	Strategic-level activities	Deputy Chief of the PLA General Staff General Xiong Guangkai visited the Philippines in May and officially launched the defense and security consultation mechanism between the two countries. Vice Director of the PLA General Logistics Department Lieutenant General Wang Qian paid a working visit to the Philippines in July.
Philippines	2006	Regional and Strategic	In May, Philippines' Chief of General Staff, Armed Forces, visits China. Between August and November, port calls was made by China's PLA naval ships to the Philippines. In October, China-Philippines held the 2nd Defense and Security Consultation in Beijing
ROK	2005	Strategic-level activities	In March/April, Minister of Defense of Korea visits China. In July, Chief of General Staff, Korean Air Force visited China. In September, Port call by Korean naval ships.
ROK	2006	Regional	In April, China's Minister of National Defense visits ROK. In August, ROK's Chief of General Staff, Navy, visited China
Russia	2003	Cooperation with other nations in non-traditional security areas - counter-terrorism cooperation	Members of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization met in Moscow and set up the Anti-terrorism Structure
Russia	2004	Cooperation with other nations in non-traditional security areas - counter-terrorism cooperation	China and Russia worked together to facilitate the development of the SCO, and joined other members in successfully launching the SCO Secretariat and Regional Anti-terrorism Structure.

Country	Year	Activity Type	Description
Russia	2005	Strategic-level activities	Two countries held two successful rounds of strategic security consultation. On March 14-17 the Assistant Chief of the General Staff visited Russia. Following the visit, Russia's Chief of the General Staff visited China from 17-20 March. On May 25 - June 8, Commander, Jinan Military Area Command visits Russia. In June, China's Assistant Chief of General Staff visits Russia. In September, China and Russia held the 9th Consultation between the General Staff Headquarters
Russia	2005	Regional	Success in the first China-Russia joint military exercise. In August, China and Russia held "Peace Mission 2005" joint military exercise, the first of its kind between the two countries. The two sides conducted real-combat drills following the theme of combating the "three evils" of terrorism, separatism and extremism and jointly responding to various crises. This exercise further enhanced military cooperation and strategic coordination between the two countries. To celebrate the 10th anniversary of China-Russia strategic coordination partnership, the Chinese side suggested that the two countries should...expand military exchanges and cooperation, work hard to ensure the success of the first China-Russia joint military exercise and make vigorous preparation for the future. In September, China's Minister of National Defense and Deputy Chief of General Staff visits Russia separately.
Russia	2006	Regional and Strategic	In March, Russian Army Commander visits China. In April, Russian Minister of Defense visits China. In May, China's Chief of General Staff visits Russia. In May, China's Political Commissar of Lanzhou Military Area Command visits Russia. In May/June, 10th Consultation Between the General Staff Headquarters of China and Russia was held in Beijing. In October, China's Assistant Chief of General Staff visits Russia and held the Consultation on the SCO Joint Anti-Terrorism Exercise
Russia	1996 and 1997	Strategic-level activities	Agreements were signed with Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan on enhancing trust in the military fields along the border areas and on mutual reduction of military forces along the border areas and, in doing so, pioneered a new security concept featuring mutual trust, benefits, equality and cooperation
Singapore	2004	Regional	In November, President Hu Jintao and Premier Wen Jiabao met with Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong during the APEC in Chile and ASEAN plus China (10 + 1) Summit in Laos
Singapore	2005	Regional	In November, Singapore's Minister of Defense visits China.
Singapore	2006	Regional	In February/March, port call by Singapore naval ships in China
Singapore	2006	Regional	In April, China's Minister of National Defense visits Singapore. In July, Singapore's Chief of General Staff visits China
Sri Lanka	2004	Strategic-level activities	On September 6 - 15, a foreign affairs delegation of the Chinese People's Liberation Army paid a visit to Sri Lanka
Sri Lanka	2005	Strategic-level activities	In August/September, President and Minister of Defense of Sri Lanka visits China.

Country	Year	Activity Type	Description
Tajikistan	2005	Regional	In June, Tajikistan's Commander of the National Guard visits China. In September, General Cao Gangchuan, Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission, State Councilor and Defense Minister, visited Tajikistan. In August, Ministers of Defense of Tajikistan visits China. In September, China's Minister of National Defense visits Tajikistan. In October, First Deputy Minister of Defense Major General Adakhamov visited China.
Tajikistan	2006	Regional	In April, Tajikistan's Minister of Defense visits China. In September, China's Deputy Chief of General Staff visits Tajikistan. Also in September, China and Tajikistan conducted a joint Counter Terrorism Military Exercise at Hatlon Prefecture, Tajikistan
Thailand	2003	Regional	The two defense ministries held their second annual security consultation
Thailand	2004	Regional	General Cao Gangchuan, Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission, and Minister of National Defense visited Thailand
Thailand	2005	Strategic-level activities	In July, Thailand's Assistant Minister of Defense visits China. Also, two defense ministries held the fourth annual security consultation and conducted the first joint military training. China's naval fleet visited Thailand and held the 5th Annual Defense and Security Consultation between the Defense Ministries of China and Thailand. In December, China and Thailand conducted a joint Maritime search-and-rescue exercise in the non-traditional security field.
Thailand	2006	Regional and Strategic	In May, Thailand's Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces visits China. In July, Thailand's Air Force Commander visits China. In August, China's Assistant Chief of General Staff visits Thailand and held the 5th Annual Defense and Security Consultation between the Defense Ministries of China and Thailand. In October, China's Chief of General Staff visits Thailand. In November/December, China's Assistant Chief of General Staff visits Thailand
Timor-Leste	2003	Cooperation with other nations in non-traditional security areas - counter-terrorism cooperation	China continued to support the United Nation's work in East Timor. As of year-end 2003, China had dispatched a total of 194 peacekeeping civilian police to East Timor. UNMISET Chief Kamallesh Sharma paid a working visit to China in November at the invitation of the Chinese Foreign Ministry
Uzbekistan	2004	Cooperation with other nations in non-traditional security areas - counter-terrorism cooperation	Fight against the “three forces” of terrorism, extremism and separatism
Uzbekistan	2005	Regional	In August, Defense Minister visited China. In December, Uzbekistan's Minister of Defense visits China.
Uzbekistan	2006	Regional	In April, Uzbekistan's Minister of Defense visits China
Viet Nam	2003	Regional	In October, General Phung Quang Thanh, Chief of the General Staff of the Vietnamese People's Army, visited China, during which the two defense ministries signed a cooperation protocol.

Country	Year	Activity Type	Description
Viet Nam	2005	Strategic-level activities	In April, the two defense ministries held the first defense and security consultation. In July, Viet Nam's Deputy Minister of Defense visits China. In October, China's President of National Defense University visits Viet Nam. Also in the same month, Vietnamese Defense Minister Pham Van Tra visited China and the two sides signed the Agreement on Joint Patrol in Beibu Gulf Between Naval Forces of China and Viet Nam.
Viet Nam	2006	Regional	In April, China's Minister of National Defense visits Viet Nam. In October, Vietnam's Chief of General Political Department, People's Army, visits China. In November/December, China's Political Commissar of Chengdu Military Area Command visits Viet Nam. In November/December, China's Assistant Chief of General Staff visits Viet Nam and held the 2nd China-Vietnam Defense and Security Consultation

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Allen, Kenneth. "PLA Air Force Foreign Relations." Alexandria: The CNA Corporation.
- Allen, Kenneth. "China's Foreign Military Relations: 2003-2004." Alexandria: The CNA Corporation.
- Allen, Kenneth. "PLA Diplomacy in Asia: Content and Consequences." Alexandria: The CNA Corporation.
- Aso, Taro. "Foreign Minister Statement at press conference." Tokyo: Japan Ministry of Foreign Affairs, December 22, 2005.
- Ba, Alice. "Southeast Asia and China." In *Betwixt and Between: Southeast Asian Strategic Relations with U.S. and China*, edited by Evelyn Goh. Singapore: IDSS, 2005.
- Bajoria, Jayshree. "Countering China's Military Modernization." *CFR Backgrounder*. February 4, 2009.
- Bajoria, Jayshree. *The China-North Korea Relationship*. June 18, 2008.
<http://www.cfr.org/publication/11097/> (accessed January 31, 2009).
- Ball, Desmond. "SIGINT Strengths Form a Vital Part of Burma's Military Muscle." *Jane's Intelligence Review* (March 1, 1998).
- Black, Michael, and Anthony Davis. "War and Peace: The UWSA and Tensions in Myanmar." *Jane's Intelligence Review* (March 2008).
- Blasko, Dennis J. "Observations on Military Modernization and International Influence—An Alternate View." *A Paper Prepared for the National Defense University Conference on China's Global Activism: Implications for U.S. Security Interests*. National Defense University, June 20, 2006.
- Bush, President George W. *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2006.
- Chang, Yihong, and Robert Karniol. "China Tempts Thailand with Modified MBT." *Jane's Defense Week* (February 15, 2006).
- Chanlet-Avery. *Thailand: Background and U.S. Relations*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2005.
- "China Goes All Out to Woo Southeast Asia." *The Korea Herald*. Seoul, August 6, 2001.

- “China, the Philippines Hold Defense Consultations in Beijing.” *People's Daily*. Beijing, October 10, 2006.
- “Chinese Defense Minister Meets DPRK Guest.” *PLA Daily*. December 13, 2008.
http://english.pladaily.com.cn/site2/news-channels/2008-12/13/content_1582899.htm (accessed January 30, 2009).
- Communist Party of China. *Constitution of the Communist Party of China*, November 14, 2002. <http://www.learnworld.com/COURSES/P141/CCP-Constitution-Nov-2002.html> (accessed September 12, 2008).
- Congressional Research Service. “China's Foreign Policy and “Soft Power.” In South America, Asia, and Africa.” Report for Congress, Washington, 2008.
- Cottey, Andrew, and Anthony Forster. “Strategic Engagement: Defence Diplomacy as a Means of Conflict Prevention.” *Adelphi Papers*, 2004.
- deLisle, Jacques. “America's Role in East Asia.” <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/Security-Watch/Detail/?lng=en&id=95997> (accessed February 9, 2009).
- Department of Defense. “Active Duty Military Personnel Strengths by Regional Area and by Country (309A).” *Military Personnel Statistics*. September 30, 2007.
<http://siadapp.dmdc.osd.mil/personnel/MILITARY/Miltop.htm> (accessed January 15, 2009).
- Department of Defense. *National Defense Strategy*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2008.
- Department of Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China. *China's Foreign Affairs 2005 Edition*. Beijing: World Affairs Press, 2005.
- Department of Policy Planning, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, People's Republic of China. *China's Foreign Affairs 2006 Edition*. Beijing: World Affairs Press, 2006.
- Dingli, Shen. “North Korea's Strategic Significance to China.” *China Security* (Autumn 2006): 19-34.
- Dolor, Beting Laygo. “China Gives Military Aid to Philippines.” *Philippine News*, Manila, March 14, 2005.
- Dong, Lixi, and Ran Rong. “Joint Military Drills Draw Attention Worldwide.” *China Facts and Figures*. December 14, 2003.
<http://www.china.org.cn/english/international/82438.htm> (accessed December 21, 2008).

- Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the United States. *Main Characteristics of China's Foreign Policy*. <http://www.china-embassy.org/eng/zmgx/zgwjzc/t35077.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008).
- Erickson, Andrew, and Lyle Goldstein. "Hoping for the Best, Preparing for the Worst: China's Response to U.S. Hegemony." *Journal of Strategic Studies* (December 2006): 955-986.
- Finkelstein, David. *Engaging DOD: Chinese Perspectives on Military Relations with the United States*. Alexandria: The CNA Corporation, 1999.
- Fukushiro, Nukaga. "Japan's Defense Policy and International Peace Cooperation Activities." *Speech delivered to the Royal United Service Institute for Defense and Security Studies*. London, January 11, 2006.
- Garamone, Jim. "Mullen Says Meetings in Pakistan Strengthen Military Relationships." *American Forces Press Service New Articles*. June 5, 2008. <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=50108> (accessed January 24, 2009).
- Gill, Bates. *Rising Star: China's New Security Diplomacy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2007.
- Goh, Evelyn. Interview by RAND Corporation. December 2005.
- Goh, Evelyn. "Southeast Asian Perspectives on the China Challenge." *The Journal of Strategic Studies* (August–October 2007): 809-830.
- Goldstein, Avery. "The Diplomatic Face of China's Grand Strategy: A Rising Power's Emerging Choice." *The China Quarterly* (December 2001): 835-864.
- Green, Michael, and Derek Mitchell. "Asia's Forgotten Crisis: A New Approach to Burma." *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2007).
- Grimmett, Richard F. *Conventional Arms Transfers to the Third World, 1986-1993*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 1994.
- Grimmett, Richard F. *Conventional Arms Transfers to Developing Nations, 1997–2004*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2005.
- Grimmett, Richard F. *U.S. Arms Sales to Pakistan*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2007.
- Gunness, Kristen. "China's Military Diplomacy in an Era of Change." June 20, 2006. www.ndu.edu/inss/symposia/pacific2006/gunnesspaper.pdf (accessed March 1, 2008).

- Ham, Lt. Gen. Carter. *U.S. Department of Defense Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) News Transcripts*. November 7, 2007.
<http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=4084> (accessed January 24, 2009).
- Hamm, Taik-young. "The Self-Reliant National Defense of South Korea and the Future of the U.S.-ROK Alliance." *Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainable Development Northeast Asia Peace and Security Project*. January 20, 2006. The Self-Reliant National Defense of South Korea and the Future of the U.S.-ROK Alliance (accessed January 13, 2009).
- Harvey, Brian. *China's Space Program*. Chichester: Praxis Publishing, 2004.
- Huxley, Tim. *Defending the Lion City: The Armed Forces of Singapore*. Londo: Allen & Unwin, 2001.
- Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations. "U.S.-China Relations: An Affirmative Agenda, A Responsible Course." 2007.
<http://www.cfr.org> (accessed February 9, 2009).
- Jane's. "Corvettes, Thailand." *Jane's Fighting Ships*. December 6, 2007.
- Jane's. "South Korea at a Glance, Jane's Sentinel Security Assessment—China and Northeast Asia." January 13, 2006.
- Jin, Dae-woong. "Junior Officials Blamed for Secrets Leak." *The Korea Herald*. Seoul, January 12, 2006.
- Joint Chiefs of Staff. *The National Military Strategy of the United States*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Press, 2004.
- Kan, Shirley A. *U.S.-China Military Contacts: Issues for Congress*. Report for Congress, Washington: Congressional Research Service, 2008.
- Kim, Kwi-kun. "Military Keeps Watchful Eye on How China-Russia Joint Exercise Proceeds—'No Information on Military Exercise Provided to South Korea.'" *Yonhap News Agency*. August 17, 2005.
- Kleine-Ahlbrandt, Stephanie, and Andrew Small. "China's New Dictatorship Democracy: Is Beijing Parting with Pariahs?" *Foreign Affairs* (January/February 2008): 38.
- Kronstadt, K. Alan. *Pakistan-U.S. Relations*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2008.
- Kurlantzick, Joshua. *Charm Offensive: How China's Soft Power is Transforming the World*. Yale University Press, 2007.

- Lague, David. *Russia and China Rethink Arms Deals*. March 2, 2008.
<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/03/02/asia/arms.php?page=1> (accessed January 29, 2009).
- Li, Lin. "China, Thailand Stage Combined Training of Special Troops." *Gov.cn*. July 16, 2007. http://www.gov.cn/misc/2007-07/16/content_686577.htm (accessed January 23, 2009).
- Liang, Yan. *www.chinaview.cn*. October 26, 2007.
http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2007-10/26/content_6947897.htm (accessed August 17, 2008).
- Maehara, Seiji. "Make Them Trigger Revitalization of Party." *FBIS-JPP20051214026004*. Translated by Foreign Broadcast Information Service. December 14, 2005.
- Malik, J. Mohan. "China-India Relations in the Post-Soviet Era: The Continuing Rivalry." *The China Quarterly (London)*, June 1995.
- Medeiros, Evan, and Taylor Fravel. "China's New Diplomacy." *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2003): 22-35.
- Medeiros, Evan S. et al. *Pacific Currents: Responses of U.S. Allies and Security Partners in East Asia to China's Rise*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2008.
- Miller, Alice L. "CHINA: A Superpower? No Time Soon." *Hoover Digest: Research and Opinion on Public Policy*. 2005.
<http://www.hoover.org/publications/digest/2938796.html> (accessed February 11, 2009).
- Nichol, Jim. *Central Asia: Regional Developments and Implications for U.S. Interests*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2008.
- Niksch, Larry A. *Korea-U.S. Relations: Issues for Congress*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2008.
- Niksch, Larry A. *U.S.-Burma Relations*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2007.
- Officials, U.S. Interview by RAND Corporation. Summer 2003.
- Office of the Secretary of Defense. "Military Power of the People's Republic of China." Annual Report to Congress, 2008.
- Patel, Nirav. "Chinese Disaster Relief Operations: Identifying Critical Capability Gaps." *Joint Forces Quarterly* (1st quarter 2009): 111-117.

- People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council. *China's National Defense in 2002*. December 2002. <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20021209/index.htm> (accessed November 5, 2008).
- People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council. *China's National Defense in 2004*. December 2004. <http://china.org.cn/e-white/20041227/index.htm> (accessed August 17, 2008).
- People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council. *China's National Defense in 2006*. December 29, 2006. <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/doctrine/wp2006.html#2> (accessed August 17, 2008).
- People's Republic of China Information Office of the State Council. "China's National Defense in 2008." January 20, 2009. http://www.china.org.cn/government/whitepaper/node_7060059.htm (accessed February 9, 2009).
- Personnel, U.S. Military. Interview by RAND Corporation. May 2003.
- "Post-Coup Thailand in the Eyes of the U.S. and China." *The Nation*. Bangkok, February 12, 2007.
- Pollack, Jonathan D. "Chinese Military Power: What Vexes the United States and Why?" *Orbis* (Fall 2007): 635-650.
- Przystup, James J., and Phillip C. Saunders. "Visions of Order: Japan and China in U.S. Strategy." *Strategic Forum* (National Defense University), June 2006.
- Putin, Vladimir. *Speech at the 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy*. February 10, 2007. <http://www.securityconference.de/konferenzen/rede.php?sprache=en&id=179>. (accessed January 29, 2009).
- "Radios, Helicopters for the Philippines." *Defense Industry Daily*. June 12, 2007.
- RAND Corporation. "Defining U.S. Interests in Central Asia." 2005. http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2005/RAND_MG338.pdf (accessed December 11, 2008).
- Restall, Hugo. "China's Bid for Asian Hegemony." *Far Eastern Economic Review* (May 2007): 10-14.
- RFE/RL Newslines*. "Kyrgyzstan, U. S. Sign Military Cooperation Agreement." November 13, 2002.

- Saunders, Phillip C. "China's Global Activism: Strategy, Drivers, and Tools." October 2006. http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Occasional_Papers/OCP4.pdf (accessed August 2, 2008).
- Serafino, Nina M. *Peacekeeping and Related Stability Operations: Issues of U.S. Military Involvement*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2006.
- Singapore Ministry of Defense. "Singapore and China Agree to Enhance Bilateral Defense Exchanges." November 16, 2005.
- Singh, Swaran. "China-South Asia: Changing Contours." *Occasional Paper for National Defense University's annual Pacific Symposium on China's Global Activism*. Fort McNair: National Defense University, June 20, 2006.
- SIPRI. *SIPRI 2008 Yearbook*. December 2008. <http://yearbook2008.sipri.org/files/SIPRIYB08summary.pdf> (accessed January 29, 2009).
- Socor, Vladimir. "Cheek by Jowl in Kyrgyzstan." *Wall Street Journal*. New York, August 8, 2003.
- "Space Programme Facilities." *Chinese Defense Today*. www.sinodefence.com/space/facility/default.asp (accessed January 29, 2009).
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. *SIPRI Yearbook 2005: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Storey, Ian. "Creeping Assertiveness: China, the Philippines, and the South China Sea Dispute." *Contemporary Southeast Asia* (April 1999): 6-9.
- 17th National Congress of the Communist Party of China. *17th National Congress of the Communist Party of China Press Center*. October 7, 2007. <http://english.cpcnews.cn/92249/92259/6277921.html> (accessed August 17, 2008).
- "13 Monitoring Stations to Ensure Successful Manned Spaceflight." *Xinhua News Service*. October 15, 2003. http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2003-10/15/content_1124282.htm.
- Traditional China-DPRK Friendship Gains New Momentum." *PLA Daily*. June 18, 2008. http://english.pladaily.com.cn/site2/news-channels/2008-06/18/content_1320570.htm (accessed January 30, 2009).
- Transparency International. "Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2006." 2006.

United States Department of State. *Security, Democracy, Prosperity; Strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2004-2009*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Press, 2003.

United States Air Force Personnel Command. "Intermediate/Senior Developmental Education Programs." *Officer Developmental Education*. May 2, 2008. http://ask.afpc.randolph.af.mil/main_content.asp?prods1=1&prods2=244&prods3=246&p_faqid=6025 (accessed November 12, 2008).

Wang, Yiwei. "Public Diplomacy and the Rise of Chinese Soft Power." *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March 2008.

Wolfe, Adam. "China: New Defense Posture." *New York for ISN Security Watch*. February 2, 2009. <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/Security-Watch/Detail/?lng=en&id=95974> (accessed February 9, 2009).

Zhu, Zhe. "China Daily: Defense Budget to Rise by 17.6 Percent." *Open Source Center*. March 5, 2008. <https://www.opensource.gov/portal/server.pt/gateway/PTARGS> (accessed March 13, 2008).

Zoellick, Robert. "Whither China: From Membership to Responsibility?" <http://merln.ndu.edu/archivepdf/china/State/53682.pdf> (accessed February 9, 2009).

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California